

तमसो ज्ञा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

905

J. A. H R S


Vol. V

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V]

July, 1930.

[Part I



Amaravati Sculpture depicting a Stupa

1930.

RAJAHMUNDRY

Printed at the Razan Press.

Published by the Andhra Historical Research Society.

Price of each part Rupees 2 or 3 shillings.

Annual Subscription } for Members: 3 Rupees or 6 Shillings.
 } for Institutions: Indian Rs. 6., Foreign: 12 sh

Postage 8 Annas or 1 Shilling Extra.

CONTENTS.

1. "The Bhujabala" of Vijayanagara History.
B. A. SALETFORE, M.A., 1—6
 2. Studies in Vijayanagara Polity.
K. ISWAR DUTT, B. A., 7—20
 3. Two Copper Plate Grants of the Śālañkāyanas.
Late K. V. LAKSHMANA RAO, M. A., 21—32
 4. Telugu Academy Plates of Śaktivarman II. (*with plates*)
Bhavaraj V. KRISHNA RAO, B. A., B. L., 33—49
 5. History of Padmanaiaks.
R. SUBBA RAO, M. A., L. T., 50
 6. Two New Copper-Plate Inscriptions of Vijayaditya I. (*with plates*)
R. SUBBA RAO, M. A., L. T., 51—56
 7. Āndhra Coins. (*with plates*)
R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T. 57—64
 8. List of Members and Subscribers
who paid their subscriptions. i—ii
-

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Vol. V.

July, 1930.

Part I.

THE "BHUJABALA" OF VIJAYANAGARA HISTORY, (A. D. 1516).

B. A. SALETORÉ, M.A.: LONDON.

One of the inscriptions edited by Mr. Rice in the "*Epigraphia Carnatica*" is the following styled "Mg. 41" dated 1516 A. D.:—"The usual invocation. (On the date specified) When the *Mahārājādhirāja Rāja paramēśvara* Vīra Kṛṣṇa Rāya Mahārāya was ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom—And Immaḍi Bhairasa Oḍeyar, son of Bommāla Lēvi, and son-in-law of the Cattle-rope-to Champions over hostile kings, Vira Miriya Bhiraṣa Oḍeya, was governing the Kaḷāṣa-Kārkaḷa kingdom the mighty (*bhujabala*) Mahārāya of Vijayanagara having come against the Tolu kingdom with an army, and having encamped on the Bhūvana channel of Mangaḷūr,—we having escaped from the country, made a petition (or vow) that if that army should go back, and we should return in peace to our country, we should repair the temple of the god Kaḷāśanātha. And that army having gone back, at the time when we returned in peace to our country, causing the temple of the god Kaḷāśanātha to be repaired through the wiseman of our *Chāvaḍi* Sūrappadēnabōva to provide for the dropping of water for one month on the god Kaḷāśanātha in our name, to be continued as long as the sun and moon endure." (Here the details of the gift etc.)¹

The late Mr. Kṛṣṇa Śāstri while editing an inscription of the Bhairasa Oḍeyar of Kārkaḷa, remarked on the above epigraph thus:—"This inscription supplies the interesting information that, during the reign of the great Kṛṣṇa Rāya of Vijayanagara, Bhujabala Mahārāya led a campaign against the Tulu-rāja, and was encamped near the

Bhuvana Śāle in Mangalūru. On this occasion the Kaḷaśa Kārkaḷa chief Yimmaḍi Bhairasa Oḍeya being dispossessed of (or not being sure of the stability of) his territory, prayed to the god at Kaḷaśa that the invading forces might leave the Tulu country and that he might be undisturbed in his kingdom. This desire being fulfilled, he made certain gifts to that god in his capacity as the ruler of the Kaḷaśa-Kārkaḷa rāya. Bhujabalamahārāya, who led the campaign, might be identified with Krishṇarāya's elder brother 'Busbarao' mentioned on p. 110 of Mr. Sewell's *'Forgotten Empire'*. The facts recorded in the inscription show that the Kaḷaśa-Kārkaḷa chiefs, who, as already noted, were trying to get independent of the Vijayanagara kings, and had, perhaps, also an idea of extending their dominions below the ghats, were now threatened to be dispossessed, but perhaps, on promise of submission were left unmolested."²

Mr. Sewell, who at one time, had declared the impossibility of identifying the "Bhujabala" of the inscriptions with the "Busbalrao" mentioned by Nuniz,³ rectified the error made by Mr. Śastri in these words. "There seems to be a mistake here. Firstly, I note that Mr. Rice does not consider the word Bhujabala in the passage in question to be a proper name. The passage runs. '*Vijayanagarada Bhujabala mahārāyaru Tulu-rojyada-māle daṇḍu*,' and is translated by Mr. Rice thus: 'The mighty (*bhujabala*) *Mahārāya* of Vijayanagara having come against the Tulu kingdom with an army.' Here there is no ruler or leader named Bhujabala. Secondly the leader of the army could only have been Nuniz's 'Busbalrao', elder brother of Krishṇadevarāya, if the date of this expedition to the Tulu country were referred to a period at least seven years earlier than the date of the inscription; because 'Busbalrao' had died when Krishṇa Dēva Rāya was placed on the throne in A.D. 1509. It is possible that the expedition did take place before Krishṇadeva's accession, and it is equally possible that it may allude to Krishṇa Dēva Rāya's own exploit shortly after he came to the throne, when he, or his generals, reduced the Ganga Rāya of Ummatūr in Mysore. The mention in "Mg. 41" of Krishṇa Dēva Rāya's supreme sovereignty over the Kaḷaśa country during the chieftainship of Immaḍi Bhairasa Oḍeyar gives us no clue to the date of the Vijayanagara army's march to Mangalūr, for this may have taken place at any period before the date of that chief's grant, or, Sunday, July 13th, A.D. 1516. But what is quite certain is that the leader of the army referred to could not have been Krishṇa Dēva Rāya's elder brother, whom Nuniz called 'Busbalrao', during, as stated by Mr. Krishṇa Śāstri, the reign of Krishṇarāya; for it was 'Busbalrāo's' death, according to Nuniz, that placed Krishṇa Dēva on the throne.

2 *Epigraphica Indica*, vol. VIII, p. 127, note (2)

3 Sewell, *Forgotten Empire* p. 180

At the date of the grant Krishna Dēva was conducting his decisive campaign in the east, and had captured Kōṇḍaviṭṭu three weeks earlier viz., June 23rd, A.D. 1516.⁴

While this explanation by Mr. Sewell settles the question of the impossibility of identifying the "Bhujabala" of the inscription with the elder brother of Krishna Dēva Rāya during the life time of the latter, it does not, I am afraid, determine finally whether or not one may refer the surname "Bhujabala" in the inscription to Krishna Dēva Rāya or to one of his generals; and it does not explain whether the epigraph records an event that took place in 1516 A.D. or earlier, as Mr. Sewell would have it. The first difficulty in the solution of this question centres round the name 'Bhujabala'. Dr. Hultzsch added a note to the remarks made on this name by Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu, to this effect—"Perhaps the name is connected with *Bhujabala*, a surname of the Hoysalas."⁵

That this was not so, and that it was a little common amongst almost all Hindu monarchs from the times of the Sāntāras down to the last days of Vijayanagara will be made out from the following Table:—

DYNASTY.	RULER.	YEAR.	REFERENCE.
Sāntāra.	Bhujabala Sāntāra.	A.D. 1066.	EC. VIII, Nr. 59, p. 154 Nr. 38 p. 143; Nr. 35, p. 135
"	Bhujabala Vīra Śanta Dēva.	A.D. 1157.	EC. VI, Kp. 14, p. 78.
Kaḷachuriya.	Bhujabala Chakra- varti Bijjala Dēva.	(?) A. D. 1160	EC. VIII, Sl. 346, p. 61
Sinda.	Bhujabala Bhīma Vīra Bijjana Dēva.	7th. year, <i>Vijaya</i> .	No. 110 A of Suppl. to the <i>Ep. Rep. S. circ.</i> for 1927.
Kaḷachuriya.	Bhujabala Chakra- varti Tribhuvana- malla Bijjala Dēva.	A.D. 1162.	EC. VII, Sk. 112, p. 71.
"	Bhujabala Chakra varti Rāyamurāri Sōvi Dēva.	A.D. 1170(?)	EC. VII Sk. 171, p. 112.
Ganga.	Bhujabala Ganga Perumāḍi Dēva.	A.D. 1105.	EC. VII, Sk. 4 p. 8.
"	"	?A.D. 1112.	EC. VII, Sh. 64. p. 25.
Ganga.	Bhujabala Ganga.	1245 A.D.(?)	EC. VII Sh. 87, p. 34.
"	Tribhuvanamalla Bhujabala Ganga Permmāḍi Dēva.	A.D. 1113.	EC. VIII, Sh. 97, p. 35.

⁴ Sewell, *Ep. Ind.*, vol IX, p. 174

⁵ *Ep. Ind.* vol VII, p. 79

Yādava.	Bhujabala Chakra-	A.D. 1230	No. 200 of Suppl. to the <i>Ep</i>
	varti Singhaṇa Dēva	-31	<i>Report S. Circle</i> 1927.
	Bhujabala Pratāpa	A.D. 1243.	<i>EC.</i> VIII, Sb. 217, p. 37.
	Chakravarti Simhaṇa		
	Dēva.		
	Bhujabala Pratāpa	A.D. 1248.	<i>EC.</i> VII Sr. 217 p. 130.
	Chakravarti Khan-		
	dhāra Dēva.		
	Bhujabala Rāma-	A.D. 1283.	<i>EC.</i> VIII Sb. 189, p. 30.
	chandra.		
	Yādavanārāyaṇa	10th year.	No. 205 of <i>Ep. Report for</i>
	Bhujabala Praudha		<i>the S. Circle</i> for 1918.
	Pratāpa Chakra-		
	varti Vīra Rāma-		
	chandra.		
Hoysala.	The mighty Vishṇu	A.D. 1117.	<i>EC.</i> V, Bl. 71, p. 60,
	named Bhujabala		
	Ganga.		
"	"	A.D. 1120.	<i>EC.</i> Bl. 147, p. 94.
"	Bhujabala Vīra	A.D. 1279.	<i>EC.</i> VI, Tk. 9, p. 104.
	Somēśvara.		
Vijaya-	Bhujabalarāya	Śaka 1421.	No. 25 of 1918.
nagara.	Vīra Pratāpa Sāluva	(=A.D. 1499	
(Sāluva)	Narasinga Dēva,	-1500)	
	father of Tammaya		
	Dēva Mahārāya.		
"	Narasinga Bhujaba-	Śaka 1424(=	No. 47 of 1916.
	larāya Danmārāya.	A.D. 1502-3)	
"	Kumāra Vīra Nara-	Śaka 1431(=	No. 408 of 1913.
	simha Bhujabala	A.D. 1508-9)	
	Vasantarāya.		
"	Vīra Bhujabala	A.D. 1524.	<i>EC.</i> IX, Ma. 82 p. 61.
	Krishṇadēvarāya.		
"	(Prince Tirumala	Śaka 1446	<i>Ep. Report.</i> for 1918 p. 167.
	is called the son of)	= A.D.	
	Bhujabala Vīra	1524-5	
	Pratāpa Krishṇa		
	Dēvarāya.		
Āraṇḍu.	Bhujabala Dēva	Śaka 1503	No. 323 of 1923; <i>Ep. Rept.</i>
	Ranga II.	= A.D. 1581-2	for 1923, p. 115.
"	Bhujabalarāya,	Svabhānu,	No. 445 of 1920.
	an officer of	Māgha, Śu. 1.	
	Harṇḍeya Nāyaka.		

Āravīḍu. Bhujapratāpa Dhātu, Kārt- *Ep. Rept.* for 1915, p. 109.
 Basavappa tika, Śu. 5
 Oḍḍaya,—the Bhuja
 pratāpa of Krishṇa
 Dēvarāya

The "Bhujabala" referred to in "Mg.41" cannot be identified with any of the names given in the above list. Mr. Sewell's explanation that it may refer to Krishṇa Dēva's "own exploit shortly after he came to the throne." cannot be accepted, when we have examined the internal evidence as given in "Mg.42", and the history of the conquests of Krishṇa Dēva. There is nothing in the inscription which suggests that "Bhujabala" was the name of Krishṇa Dēva or that he came to Tuluva in 1516 A.D. or earlier; but the epigraph clearly indicates the name of one of his generals. In the original we have Śrīmatu Śrīman mahārājādhirāja Rājaparamēśvara Śrī Vīra Krishṇa Rāya Mahārāyaru Sukha-sankathāvinodadim-prithvirājyamgey-uttihalli."6 From this it is evident that the emperor was "ruling the kingdom of the world" (i.e., was probably in the capital), and was not conducting a campaign. If the engraver wanted to convey the idea of the emperor's presence in Tuluva, some such expression like the following would have been used:—"when that Krishṇa Rāya Mahārāya was in the camp (hīḍu) of —"7 The reference to one of his generals is stated in these words—"Vijayanagarada Bhujabala Mahārāya Tuḷurāyada mēle daṇḍu bandu."8 It is this General with whose identification we are for the present concerned. We cannot agree with Mr. Sewell, who places the event mentioned in "Mg.41" in the early years of Krishṇadēva's reign, when that monarch was engaged in the subjugation of the Ummatur chieftains, even according to Mr. Sewell's own estimate. For we are told by him the following—"We learn from other sources that about this time (i.e., A.D. 1510) Krishṇadēvarāya was engaged with a refractory vassal in the Maisūr country, the Ganga Rājah of Ummatur, and was completely successful."9 If Krishṇadēva conquered the Ganga Rājah in 1510 A.D., he would not have taken six years—the date of the inscription "Mg.31" is 1516 A.D.—to cross the Maisūr territory in order to punish another refractory chieftain in Tuluva. Nor would the latter commemorate in A.D. 1516 an event that had taken place six years earlier! The fact is, there is nothing for us to suspect that the event mentioned in "Mg.41" had taken place prior to A.D. 1516. As Mr. Sewell relates Krishṇadēvarāya was away in the east in or about A.D. 1516, although inscriptions of the same date give us the information that the great ruler was for a brief space of time in the capital in the course of

6 *E.C.* VI, M9.41 o. o p. 261 (Text)

7 *E.C.* VIII, Sb. 278, p. 249.

8 *E.C.* VI, Mg.41 op.cit

9 Sewell, *Forgotten Empire*, p. 130

his famous campaigns. From the inscription at Śrīśailam dated Śaka 1483, Yuva, Śravana, Śu. di. 15, Wednesday (July 25th, Wednesday A.D. 1515),¹⁰ we learn that Krishṇadēvarāya after bestowing gifts at Amarāvati, came to Śrī Parvatam and had maṇḍapas constructed in the car street. According to the inscription at Ahōbālam dated Śaka 1438, Yuva, Pushya Śu. di. 15, Friday (December, 21st Friday, A. D. 1515)¹¹ the king on his second campaign visited Ahobalam, and presented the god with great gifts. Did Krishṇadēvarāya in the short interval between his first and second campaign, when he was in the capital, think of leading an army into 'Tuḷuva'? This seems most unlikely when we realise two facts—the position of the petty Tuḷuva chieftain Immaḍi Bhairasa Oḍeyar, and the nature of the second campaign of Krishṇadēva. It is was in the course of this great war in 1515-6 A.D. that he subjugated Kalinga, Bezwāda, the Mahāpātrā rulers, stormed the forts of Anantagiri, Undrakonda, Aruvapalli, Jallipalli, Kandikonda, Kappaluyāyi, Nallakonda, Kammbamettu, Kanakagiri, Sankagiri, and other fortresses, and marched into the heart of the Kalinga country where at Poṭṇūru he planted a pillar of victory.¹² In the Ś'aka year 1438 Dhātū (A. D. 1516, April) he returned from his northern victories and built the northern gōpuram of the Chidambaram Temple.¹³ A monarch who had thus won at the point of his sword the eastern regions, would not have thought it worth while to march against an insignificant and faint-hearted ruler of Tuḷuva who, fleeing from his country, sought shelter under the aegis of his tutelary god. The 'Bhujabala' therefore, has to be referred to as a leader of Krisanadevarāya—a general who about A.D. 1515 must have been near-about Tuḷuva. We cannot identify him with any officer of Haṇḍeyanāyaka because we have no evidence till now that this latter chief had anything to do with Tuḷuva. On the other hand, we may identify him with a general of the Vijayanagara emperor, whose surname was Bhujabala, and who was sent by his master to the Western Ghats in A.D. 1515. Such a person who satisfies all conditions is Māde nāyaka. In A.D. 1515 Māde nāyaka was on the Western Ghats. An inscription of that date informs us that Krishna Rāya's Bhujabala-pratāpa Māde-nāyaka, for the lord of Puri, (his praise) the god Sōmēśvara of Pura, with unflattering devotion," bestowed the village of Pura in the Yeleyuru-sthāla.¹⁴ We confess that we do not know the causes which brought Mādenāyaka to Pura. But there cannot be a doubt that it was this same "Krishṇarāya's Bhujabala "Mādenāyaka who is mentioned as "the Bhujabala of Vijayanagara" in 1516 A.D. when he frightened the Kaḷāṣa-Kārkaḷa ruler into subjection by encamping on the Bhuvana-channel of Mangalūru.

10 Ep No 18 of 1915, Swamikannu Pillai, *The Indian Ephemeris*, V p. 233

11 Ep No 94 of 1915 *Ep. Report* for 1915, p. 109, Swamikannu V, *Ibid.*

12 *Ep. Report* for 1920, p. 112—113

13 *Ep. Report* for 1914, p. 98 A.S. R. for 1908—9, p. 181

14 E.C. XII, Kg. 25 p. 86, This inscription was found in a field in the grama of Hōsuru, Kunigal Taluk,

STUDIES IN VIJAYANAGARA POLITY.

K. ISVARA DUTT, B.A.
(Local Fund Audit Department.)

Continued from page 188 of IV above.

There are also many pearls and seed-pearls to be found there, which are brought from Ormuz and Cael—also silk brocades, scarlet cloth and coral.”⁷ Bhatkal was a great seaport during that time, on the west coast, known for its exports of iron, spices, drugs, myrabolams and import of horses and pearls. After the Portuguese occupation of Goa horses and pearls were being imported through that port.⁸

Paes says, that ‘The kingdom has many places on the coast of India; they are sea-ports with which we are at peace and in some of them we have factories namely Amcola, Mirgeo, Honor, Batecalla, Mangalore, Bracelor and Bacanor.’⁹ Thus we find that extensive over-sea-trade was carried on during that time.

About seaborne trade during the time of Bukkaraya and Hariharāya II, we have a graphic account of the same in the *Haravilāsam* of poet Śrīnātha who dedicated it to the merchant prince Avachi Tippiyaya Setṭi of Kānchīpura. This merchant prince and his brothers Tirumalasetṭi and Chāmisetṭi were by appointment, supplying to the courts of Hariharāya, Kumārāgiri of Kōṇḍavīḍu, Ferozshah and Gajapati, precious articles required by them. He imported camphor plants from the Punjab, gold (plate or dust) from Jalanogi, elephants from Simhaladvīpa (Ceylon), fine horses from Hurumāñji (Ormuz), pure musk from Goa, pearls from Āpaga (Sea,) musk (*kasturikāṅkam*) from Chōṭangi and fine silks from China,¹⁰ During the time of Dēvarāya II, according to an epigraph we learn about Mōṭupalli the port flourishing on the east coast and the import duties, levied on the various articles that were imported.¹¹ We also know from

7 *Forgotten Empire* p 129 8 *Ibid* p 128 9 *Ibid* p 237

10 Śrīnāthas's *Haravilāsam Canto I*

11 *Ins of the Mad Prsy.* vol. II Ongole 111 A

“స్వస్తిశ్రీ శకవరుషాబులు ౧౩౧౨ అగు నేటి దుర్ముఖసంవత్సర మాఘశుద్ధ ౧ శుక్రవారము. స్వస్తిశ్రీ మన్మహాధిరాజ రాజపరమేశ్వర చకుస్సముద్రాధీశ్వర హరిహరరాయలు మార దేవరాయ ఒడయలు మోటుపల్లికియిచ్చిన ధర్మశాసనము: వోడదిగిన సరకులకు నుంకాలు మోటుపల్లిపట్టణ మయాదలు ఎప్పటికి ఎన్నిసరకులుదిగిన అయిదురెళ్ళు ఆయంపనీడికప్పడి. దిగుమతిసరకులకు గరిశవకటింటికి యెనిమిది నుంకములు రాజకరుకను ఆధువలూలు. యేబది పగ

Amuktamālyada that elephants were imported from Ceylon and horses from Persia.¹²

It is interesting to note the precepts laid down by Krishnarāya were to be followed by him towards the treatment of foreign merchants and their imports. The king should see that the imports in horses, elephants, diamonds, sandalwood, and pearls etc. are encouraged and commerce developed thereby. The foreigners who land in the territory, on account of famine, disease and exhaustion, should be sent to see mines, cattle, and gardens in the empire. Those who deal in elephants and horses, should be lodged in good houses in the Capital, allowed the audience of the king always, and be given presents. The King should see that the elephants and horses imported were not to be allowed to reach the hands of the enemy through them; the merchants should be treated as his own friends so that they may not do so.¹³

A Commercial Treaty of A. D. 1546.

A commercial treaty between the Portuguese and the Vijayanagar Emperor Sadāśivarāya was executed on 26th February 1546. Rev. Heras in his monumental work on the *Aravīdu* Dynasty, quotes the clauses of the treaty in full.¹⁴ The main clauses are quoted below:—

1 "The Governor of Goa will allow Arab and Persian Horses landed at Goa to be purchased by the King or Vijayanagar, none being permitted to be sent to Bijāpur nor to any of its ports, and the King of Vijayanagar will be bound to purchase all those that were brought to his ports on quick and proper payment.

2 "The King of Vijayanagar will compel all the merchants in his kingdom trading with the coasts to send their goods through Onor (Honavar) and Barcelor (Barsur), wherein the King of Portugal, will send factors who will purchase them all and the Governors of India will be forced to send the Portuguese merchants there in order to buy them. On the same way, the King of Vijayanagar will forbid the exportation of iron and saltpetre with the kingdom of Adilshah from any port or town of his own, and the merchants will be compelled to bring this merchandise to the harbours of the kingdom of Vijayanagar where they will be quickly purchased by the Governor of India not to cause them loss.

దాలకట్టను అయిదురూకలున్న అడ్డె. పడమట లకు తావులు నేయించే నారికి నోవుమీద వెలచేసి యెనిమిదచేసి తరుగు నూటికి రూకనుపైట్టి ఆగూలకు బారిపనింటికి ఒక్కటి. ముద్రపరుసును కేండు కానును, పొట్టుచి వెల్లిపచ్చదాలనును ఈమర్కాదను. పన్నుచీరెను సారూపానను నాలుగు కానును కియికాలచీరెను సారూపానను కాను. రోళ్ళము రాచనారకొని అందు మూడవపాటు దేవరాజనొడయలు బడయుదురు!"

¹² *Amuktamālyada*, Canto II vv 1 & 20

¹³ *Ibid* Canto IV vv 245 and 258

¹⁴ Heras; *Aravīdu* Dynasty; and *Forgotten Empire* p 62 and 186

3 'All the cloths of the kingdom of Vijayanagar will not be brought over to the port of Adilshah, but either to Ancola or to Onor (Hanovar) and in the same way the Governors will find the Portuguese merchants to go there to purchase them and to exchange them for Copper, Coral, Vermillion, Mercury, China-silks and all other kinds of goods which came from the kingdom, and he the King of Vijayanagar will order his merchants to purchase them.'

This treaty, throws a flood of light not only on internal and external commerce of the day, but also on the perpetual animosities that existed between the banner of the Boar and the Crescent. Suffice to say such commercial boycott, together with the haughty and arrogant policy of the Regent of the day, made the Mohommadan to rally finally under one banner and understand the old adage "United we stand; divided we fall." The dis-intergration of the empire, tolled the death-knell of the Portuguese trade. The extracts quoted by Sewell in his history of the *Forgotten Empire*, from the writings left by the Portuguese, testify to the fact. To quote one. "By this destruction of the Kingdom of Bisnaga, India and our state were much shaken; for the bulk of the trade undertaken by all was for this kingdom, to which they carried horses, velvets, satins and other sorts of merchandise, by which they made great profits; and the custom house of Goa suffered much in its revenue, so that from that date till now the inhabitants of Goa began to live less well; for faizes and fine cloths were a trade of great importance for Persia and Portugal, and it then languished and the gold pagodas, of which every year more than 500,000 were laden in the ships of the kingdom, were then worth $7\frac{1}{2}$ *Tangas*, and today they are worth $11\frac{1}{2}$ and similarly every kind of coin."¹⁵

VI

THE MILITARY ORGANISATION AND EXPENDITURE.

The military expenditure of the period was enormous and practically consumed the major portion of either the public exchequer or that of the viceroy's treasury. We had already an occasion to mention, when dealing with the Viceroys of the Vijayanagar Empire, that the Provincial Satraps had to maintain a fixed army of infantry, cavalry, and elephants according to the income derived by them, to preserve peace and order, and to assist the Emperor during his campaigns.

The military of the day consisted of "infantry, cavalry and the force of Elephants.¹ According to Paes. "Now I desire you to know that this"

¹⁵ *Forgotten Empire* pp. 210—211.

1. *Amuktamalyada*, Canto IV. 232; 233.

"King has continuously a million fighting troops in which are included 55,000 cavalry in armour; all these are in his pay and he has these troops always together and ready to be despatched to any quarter whenever such may be necessary. I said, being in the city of Bisnaga, the king despatching a force against a place, one of which he has by the sea coast, and he sent fifty captains with 1,50,000 Soldiers, amongst whom there were many cavalry. He has many elephants and when the king wishes to show the strength of his power amongst the three kings bordering on the kingdom, they say that he puts into the field two million soldiers; in consequence of which he is the most feared of kings of any in these parts."² There can be no exaggeration in this, Nuniz states that a force of 703,000 foot, 82,600 horses and 551 elephants was mobilised when Krishnarāya marched against Raichur.³ Abdur Razak.⁴ states that the army consisted of eleven lacs of men (11,00,000). Yet another Traveller estimated the figure of the army at about a million men and upwards.⁵

Personal Retinue of the King.

Nuniz states, that beside the large army that was maintained for the defence of the kingdom, the king has continually fifty thousand paid soldiers amongst whom are six thousand horsemen who belong to the Palace Guard, to which six thousand belong the two hundred, who are obliged to ride with him. He has also twenty thousand spearmen and shield bearers and three thousand men to look after the elephants and stables.

Military Expenditure.

Abdur Razack informs that the payment to the troops was made every four months.⁷ The maintenance of elephants and horses, certainly entailed a heavy expenditure. "He has sixteen hundred grooms who attended the horses and has also three hundred horse trainers, and two thousand artificers viz.. blacksmiths, masons and carpenters and washermen who wash clothes. These are the people he has and pays every day; he gives them their allowance at the gate of the Palace. To the six thousand horsemen, the King gives houses free and gives provision for them every month and all these horses are marked with the King's mark.⁸ Peas also comments "how great expenses may be, and besides these that of the servants who have the care of the horses, and elephants, and by this you

2. *Forgotten Empire* p. 230.

3. *Ibid.* p. 107.

4. *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV. pp. 107.

5. *Forgotten Empire* page 148. An account of Krishnarāya's campaigns is given in *Rayavachakamu* where the vast armies led by the Emperor are described.

6. *Ibid.* p. 381

7. *Elliot's History of India*, vol IV p. 105—125

8. *Forgotten Empire*, p. 381.

will be able to judge what will be the revenue of the City.⁹ Krishṇa-dēvarāya lays down the maxim that the King should divide his income into four parts and two parts of the same should be spent for the defence of the Kingdom, i.e., of the army.¹⁰ That means more than 50% of the Public exchequer was spent on the maintenance of the military force.

Artillery.

Paes mentions that among the troops, he witnessed, he had seen "musqueteers with their musquets and blunderbrusses¹¹ and describes how "the valleys and all the ground trembled with the discharges of arms and musquets; and to see the bombs and fire mirsiles over the plains.¹² In the battle of Raichur cannons were used by Krishṇarāya.¹³

Cavalry..

During the time of Krishṇarāya, and efficient cavalry was maintained which gained for its master victories over many a field of battle. The Emperor-Poet in his Peom "*Amuktamālyada*" describes how he won victories against the troops of Adil Khan with the assistance of his cavalry alone.¹⁴ The horses for the cavalry, were purchased, from the Portugese who settled at that time on the West Coast and from the Arab merchants who traded with the Vijayanagar City at that time. Krishṇarāya describes the horses that are born in and purchased from the countries of Bāhlika; Pāraśika Śaka; Dhāra and Aratta countries. They are so high that the rider cannot sit on their back without the help of two Anka-Vanni but when they run with the bodies stretched they will be so short that the feet of the rider touch the ground.¹⁵ Nuniz states "that the King buys twelve, thirteen thousand horses of Ormuz and country-breds of which he chooses the best for his own stables and gives the rest to his Captains and gains much money by them; because after taking out good Persian horses, he sells those which are country-bred and gives five for a thousand Paradaos, and they are obliged to pay him the money for them in the month of September; and with the money so obtained, he pays for the Arabs, that he buys of the Portugese, in such a way that his captains pay the cost of the whole without anything going out of the Treasury".¹⁶

The accession of Krishṇarāya to the throne synchronised with the advent of the Portugese on the west coast. The Portugese Governor Albuquerque conquered, Goa on the west coast in March A. D. 1510 and

9 *Ibid*, p. 281

10 *Amuktamālyada*, Canto IV v, 238

11 *Forgotten Empire*, p. 279

12 *Ibid* p. 279

13 *Ibid* p. 342

14 Canto 1. Stanza 42

15 Canto 2, Verse 29

16 *Forgotten Empire*, pages 381-82

after some vicissitudes of fortune, firmly established his power there at the end of the same year. Krishnarāya did not take much notice of the advent of this European power on the west coast, as he might have thought, that it would not cause to be any menace to his empire. The Portugese were fortunate enough to secure some important concessions at his hands and to be allowed to build a fort at Bhatkal. The emperor was anxious to secure fine horses from them, for his perpetual wars against the Mohammadan for Adil Shah, who his in turn also in vain approached the Portugese for the supply of horses for the wars he waged against the Vijayanagar Emperors. At one time, the Emperor offered Albuquerque £. 20,000 for the exclusive right to trade in horses but the latter did not accede to the request of the monarch. However Albuquerque promised that he would give to the Emperor the right of refusal of all his horses if he would pay him 30,000 *cruzadoo* per annum for the supply, and send his own servants to Goa to fetch away the animals and also that he would aid the king in his war if he was paid the expense of his troops.¹⁷

Description of the Cavalry by Paes.

Paes was an eye witness of the splendour of the cavalry of the day. He describes the riders and the horses vividly in the following terms. "The cavalry were mounted on horses fully caparisoned and on their forehead with plates some of silver but most of them gilded, with fringes of twisted silk of all colours and reins of the same, others had trappings of Mecca velvet, which is velvet of many colours with fringes and ornaments: others had them on other silks, such as satins and damask, and others of brocade from China and Persia. Some of the men with gilded plates had them set with many large precious stones and on the borders lacework of small stones. Some of these horses had on their foreheads, heads of serpents and of other large animals of various kinds, made in such a strange manner that they were a sight to see for the perfection of their make. The horsemen were dressed in quilted tunics, also of brocade and velvet and every kind of silk. These tunics are made of layers of very strong raw leather and furnished with other iron plates that make them strong; some have these plates gilded both inside and out, and some are made of silver. Their headpieces are in the manner of helmets on the borders covering the neck and each had its piece to protect the face; they are of the same fashion as the tunics. They wear on the neck gorgets, all gilded, others made of silk with plates of gold and silver, others of steel as bright as a mirror. At the waists they have swords and small battle axes and in their hands javelins with the shafts covered with gold and silver."¹⁸

¹⁷ *Ibid* p. 128.

¹⁸ *Ibid* p. 276.

Infantry.

Infantry formed the bulk of the army of the Empire and contained the best of the human blood of the day. The weapons used were arrows, battle axes, spears, swords, bombs and missiles and the infantry can therefore, be roughly divided into archers, shieldmen, and musqueteers. The description of the infantry is minutely presented to us by Paes.¹⁹ To quote him again: "Shieldmen with their shields, with many flowers of gold and silver on them, others with figures of Tigers and other great beasts others all covered with silver leafwork beautifully wrought, others with painted colours, others black so polished, that you can see into them, as into a mirror, and their swords so richly ornamented that they would not be possibly move so. Of the archers, I must tell you that they have bows plated with gold and silver, and others have them polished and their arrows very neat and feathered that they could not be better; daggers but their waists and battle-axes with the shafts and ends of gold and silver; then you see musqueteers with their musquets and blunderbusses and their thick tunics, all in their order. Then the moorswith their javelins and Turkish bows, with many bombs and spears and fire missiles."²⁰

The narrative of the description of the army of the day will be incomplete without that of the '*Gajabalam*' or *elephant* forces. Again we go to Paes for information. He says, "The elephants in the same way are covered with caparison of velvet and gold with fringes and rich clothes of many colours and with bells so that the earth resounds; and on their heads are painted faces of giants and other kinds of beasts. On the back of each one of them are three or four men dressed in their quilted tunics and armed with shields and javelins and they are arrayed as if for a fray."²¹ Nuniz gives yet another account of the War elephants. "The war elephants go with their '*howlahs*' from which four men fight on each side of them and the elephants are completely clothed and on their tusks they have knives fastened, much ground and sharpened with which they do great harm."²²

Fortresses in the Empire.

The whole empire was studded with innumerable forts, strongly armed with garrisons to defend them when necessity arose. The forts were divided into four kinds '*Sthala Durga*', '*Jala Durga*' '*Giri Durga*' and '*Vana Durga*'.²² '*Sthala Durga*' means fort built on land; '*Jala Durga*' means fort surrounded or protected by water on all sides; '*Giri Durga*'

19 *Ibid* p. 277

20 *Ibid* p. 327 See also the description of the Battle of Raichur p. 327

21 *Ibid* p. 277

22 *Ibid* p. 328

22 *Ramarajiyamu of Venkiah in Sources of Vijayanagar History* p. 80.

In the Ahebilam and the Amaravati Inscriptions of Sri Krishnadēvarāya the names of *Sthala Durga* and *Giri Durga* are mentioned, .

means fort constructed on a rock or hill and *Vana Durga* means fort in the midst of forests or protected by forest on all sides. The names of the forts that we came across both in the inscriptions and the contemporary literature are given below. The list may be pretty long, but it shows the impregnable position of the Empire when it was in its zenith.

North Eastern Portion of the Empire.

Vinukonda, Konḍaviḍu, Bellamkonda, Vēlupukonda, Jallipalli, Kambham-meṭu Kottam, Kanakagiri, Māḍem¹(Maḍgole) Oddādi, Rajahmundry and Konḍapalli.

Central Portion.

Ganginēnikonda; Kandaṇḍu (Karnul), Kalumkolu, Kōṭarāchūru Raichur, Mosalimaḍugu, Yātagiri, (Yadgir) Sātanikōṭa, Gutti, Ādavani, Chandragiri, Penukonda, Gaṇḍikōṭa, Ānegondi. Mudgal, Ākulapāḍu, Vijayanagar, Dhārāpuram, Gingi, and Bonagiri, (Bhuvangiri).

Eastern Portion.

Kandakur and Udaigiri.

Southern Portion.

Ummattur, Śivsamudram, Śrīringapatnam, Madura, and Rajah-gambhiram.

Western Portion.

Bhaṭkal, Mangalore, and Baṛukūru.

Krishṇāya propounds his own policy towards the maintenance of the forts and its garrisons. In his view the Brahmin only should be entrusted with the charge of the forts, and that he should be put in command of sufficient of troops to withstand any formidable foe. The fort should be provided even with the proverbial cheese of the tiger and arrangements made to last at least for one hundred years.²³ The precept he propounded was put into practice and we already noticed elsewhere that most of his viceroys, generals and ministers hail from the Brahmin community.

VII

FOREIGN POLICY AND TREATMENT OF CONQUERED CHIEFS.

The foreign policy of the emperors till the time of Sadāśiva Rāya was passive and it was only during the period of the unfortunate and imbecile Emperor, that the *de-facto* ruler, Rāmarāya, the astute statesman, diverted all his political acumen and indefatigable energies through channels of intrigue and "*divide-et-impera*". The foreign policy became haughty and aggressive and the vast Empire paid the everlasting penalty for the same.

Slowly and silently the founders of the Empire expanded its territories without any show of thirst for land and desire for power. Bukka I., The first imperialist, as we may call him, and crown prince Kampana, had, the innate ambition to expand the boundaries of the Kingdom and the result was the conquest of Chōla and Pāṇḍya territories of the south, the rulers of which were the enemies of the Kings of Vijayanagar. The Mohammadan rule at Madura was rooted out with the ostensible object of restoring the religion and peace of the country.¹

The main object of the foreign policy of the emperors seems to be to drive out the Mohammedans from the Deccan successfully, and the object was attained for three centuries. Extricated from the prison cell of the Mohammadan Emperor, the founder of the Empire, began to think of the extirpation of the power of the crescent. The Mohammadan viceroyalty at Anegundi was abolished and the two illustrious founders, and especially the younger Imperialist wanted to blandish the sword. The result was, as we had already seen the conquest of the south up to the present Madura and Trichinopoly Districts. The last trace of the Mohammadan rule in the Peninsula was thus wiped out.

It was an irony of fate, that when, the foundation was laid for the Hindu Empire in the south to resist the tide of aggression of the Mohammadans in the north, another foundation was laid, a decade later, for a Mohammadan power, the Bahamani Kingdom at Kalubarge (Gulbarga), the establishment and consequent dismemberment of which, continuously affected the foreign policy of the Vijayanagar Emperors; and till the final unity of the dismembered parts of the same, dug the grave of the Empire in the South.

The bone of contention between the Bahamani Kingdom of the north and the Vijayanagar Empire in the South was the Raichur *Doab*, a triangular piece of territory that lay between the juncture of the Krishna and Tungabhadra rivers. This piece of territory corresponds to Alsace-Lorraine of Europe, for the possession of which constantly wars were waged by the two formidable powers. The foreign policy of the Emperors upto Krishna Rāya, had always a certain bearing on the conquest of this *Doab*. Raichur and Mudgal were the two important forts that lay in that territory. The vanquished Mohammadan felt the humility of the loss, and the victorious Hindus felt the pride of the gain. But both the humiliation and the hilarity that were engendered in the breasts of the two contending parties, gradually did sow the seeds for the downfall of the Hindu Empire. The vicissitudes of future that attended the efforts at its possession, will be briefly narrated here showing only the foreign policy of the Vijayanagar.

1 *Kampana Charitam in Sources of Vijayanagar History*, p. 23

Bukka I. claimed the *Doab* from Mujahid Shah Bahamani and annexed it to his territories, but subsequently abandoned the same and agreed to receive the tribute from the successor of Mujahid. Another attempt by Bukka II. was futile and in his turn, had to pay the Sultan a large indemnity and an annual tribute. Dēvarāya II, provoked by Sultan Alauddin, invaded the Bahamani Kingdom, laid waste the territory that comprised the *doab* and conquered the two forts of Raichur and Mudgal. But the war ended with the cessation of hostilities on either side, the old boundaries were restored and the Vijayanagar King had still to pay the annual tribute.² During the time of Krishṇa Dēvarāya it was finally annexed to the Vijayanagar Empire after the battle of Raichur, since he wanted to finally settle the subject of contention. Robert Swell describes the political effects of the Battle of Raichur as follows:

"The Hindu victory so weakened the power and prestige of the Adil Shah that he ceased altogether to dream of any present conquest on the south and turned his attention to cementing alliances with the other Mohammadan Sovereigns, his neighbours. The victory also caused all the other Mohammadan Powers in the Deccan similarly to reflect on the political situation of the South and this had eventually led to a combination of all of them, half a century later which finally overthrew the Vijayanagar Empire and cleared the way for the south. It further effected the Hindus generally by rousing in them a spirit of pride and arrogance, which added fuel to the fire, and became positively intolerable to their neighbours, and accelerated their own downfall."³

Relations with the Gajapatis.

The Gajapatis was the second foe which, the Vijayanagar Empire had to reckon with. The expansion of the Empire in the East and North-East was hindered by the Kingdom of Kalinga which bordered on those two sides. The aggressive spirit of the King of Kalinga, was a force to be reckoned with and the safety of the Empire lay only in consolidating the same to the limits of natural boundaries *i. e.* on the East, the Bay of Bengal and on the north by the river Krishṇa ... The death of Dēvarāya II. was, unfortunately, taken advantage of by the Gajapati and the Aśvapati (Bahamani Sultan) who at once entered into a confederacy and invaded the Vijayanagar Empire. They then penetrated as far as Kānchī, in the south.

² The accounts of the Ferishta and Abdul Razack are conflicting on this point, but the latter who states that Devaraya II. was successful in the expedition may be trusted as he was at that time in the great Hindu capital.—Ed.

³ *Forgotten Empire* p. 155.

In the Sanskrit Drama '*Gaṅgaḍāsa-pratāpavilāsam*' the joint invasion of Vijayanagar by the Sultan and the King of Kalinga, is mentioned, but it states that the invasion was bravely withstood by the Emperor Mallikārjuna. Certain epigraphs found in the South Arcot District confirm the statement of southern invasion by the King of Kalinga. The invasion was not a passing in-road but a permanent occupation of territory on the East Coast right upto the Tanjore District.⁴ Naturally the Vijayanagar Emperors had to deal with the invader with a firm hand. The matters stood as they were, till the advent of the great Sālūva Chief and afterwards Emperor, Sālūva Narasimha Rāya who by defeating the ruler of Kalinga regained the lost territories and added the provinces of Kondavīdu and Udaigiri to the Vijayanagar Empire⁵ with the assistance of his Tuluva Chieftain Īśvara Narasārāya. But the two forts again changed hands during the time of Immaḍi Narasimharāya and Vīra Narasimharāya. Finally it was left to Emperor Krishnarāya to inflict signal defeats on the King of Kalinga and take his son and nobles captives in war as evidenced by the Emperor's Udaigiri and Kondavīdu Inscriptions⁶.

Treatment of the Enemy.

Except perhaps of in cases, where rebellious chiefs were killed during the course of battles waged, treatment of the enemy that actually surrendered, was generous according to the Literary and Epigraphical evidence we have got. Sōmadēvarāja who assisted the founders of the Empire in the conquest of Ānēgondi, by fighting against the its Mahomedan ruler, took the latter captive and released him after he had made obeisance. The captive prince was so pleased with his victorious foe, that he sent him a present of 6,000 horse and promised to name his own son after his Captor.⁷ Though *Kamparāyacharitam* mentions that Sāmbuvarāya was killed in battle by Kamparāya,⁸ the Telugu poem *Jaimini Bhāratam*⁹ and the Sanskrit poem *Sālūvābhīyudayam*¹⁰ mention that Sāmbuvarāya was reinstated on the throne after he was captured. Krishnarāya's treatment of his subdued enemies was exemplary and noteworthy. In his first victorious campaign against the Ummattur, the subjugated chiefs were restored to their position after they made their obeisance.¹¹ In his treatment of prince Vīrabhadra Gajapati and other

4 *Ep. Rep.* 1919, Para 47

5 *Saluvabhyudayam*. Canto iv in *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, p. 90. and *Varahapurānam*, Canto I. vv. 30, 31.

6 *Nellore Inscriptions*, Udaigiri No. 40 and *Ep. Ind.* vol VI, pp 177—233.

7 *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, p. 79

8 *Ibid* page 23.

9 *Ibid*, Canto I. verse 32.

10 *Saluvabhyudayam* Canto I. vv. 46—47

11 *Krishna Raya Vijayam* Canto III.

Chiefs of Kalinga. Krishnadēvarāya, had set an example not only to his successors, but also to other Emperors. They were captured alive and the prince Virabhadra was even given a principality to rule over, according to an inscription.¹²

Krishna Raya lays down incidentally in his work *Āmuktamālyada* the following precepts for guidance, towards the treatment of the subdued foes¹³.

1. The ambassadors of the hostile king should be respected and by that means, the foe would become a friend.

2. After you have subdued your foe, do not kill him, but take his property. What can a serpent do, if its fangs are taken out? If you let him off without killing him, he will trust you for the kindness shown to him.

3. The king should ascertain by various means, the invisible foe and should deal with him severely and boldly. If he does not do so he is failing in his duty.

Then he propounds the following principles for the guidance of a king in his foreign policy.¹⁴

1. The friendship of a foe can be gained only by the kind treatment of his ambassadors.

2. Like the boar which sleeps on the pinnacle of a mountain with one eye opened and the other shut, the king should always have an eye on his enemies, while administering the kingdom.

3. When the king is harassed by his own party he should make friends with his enemy even by ceding him half his own kingdom, as the danger from his own party is more than that from that of snake.

4. The enemy who is afraid, of approaching the kingdom, should never be conquered by force. He should be made to move on his own accord, until he is caught, like the fish which is slowly dragged to the shore by the fisherman.

5. The king should never determine to subdue the enemy with vengeance. He should be tactful.

6. When the enemy is surrounded on all sides, by the forces, his forces should not be massacred.

7. The kingdom of the enemy and the forts that be in it may be conquered. If their women are captured, extend to them the same treatment which they would receive at their own homes. Do not talk harshly with their ambassadors.

¹² *Ep. Carn.* vol. IX, D.G. 107

¹³ Canto IV, Verses, 225, 235 and 250

¹⁴ Canto IV Verses: 225, 241, 249, 251, 263, 264, 267 and 268.

8. If the territory of the enemy is impenetrable on account of the thick forests, mountains and full of poisonous waters, dangerous diseases, the king should not enter the same, though it fetches him fabulous wealth, but send his soldiers only to subdue the same.*

Relations between the Empire and the Portuguese.

The arrival of the Portuguese on the West Coast, synchronised the beginning of the rule of Krishnarāya. The advent of the foreign power was little noticed by him. He might have felt confident that the mighty empire could cope with the small Christian power on the West Coast. His anxiety to secure the horses of the best breed, always swayed his policy towards the Portuguese and he maintained continuously cordial relations with them. So during the time of his successors, whose policy also was influenced by the same purpose, friendly relations continued and culminated in a commercial treaty with the Portuguese Governor.¹⁵ There was a short period of clash between the two and it did not effect the mutual good-will that existed between the two powers. The general result of non interference with this small maritime power was the loss of the rich pearl fisheries on the Pandyan Coast and the gradual conversion of the people to Christianity on the West Coast. ..

VIII

THE KING AND THE MINISTER.

The King in Vijayanagar Polity.

The Vijayanagar sovereign was at no time a blood-thirsty tyrant but a constitutional monarch who sought the counsel of a minister or a council of ministers, appointed to his Court. He was not the master of his subjects, but their servant. Emperor Krishnarāya says, 'The anointed king who is equal to God and who is created by God ... should put up with the trouble and relieve the sufferings of the world ... So with great care and according to your power, you should attend to the work of protecting the good and punishing the wicked without neglecting anything that you see or hear ... A crowned King should always rule with an eye towards '*Dharma*'. So skilfully fulfilling your '*Dharma*' you get rid of your threefold debt and attain fame among your equals.¹ Thus the guiding policy of the monarch was the welfare of his subjects, irrespective of their religion or race. He is the protector of the oppressed and benefactor.

¹⁵ *Forgotten Empire*, pp. 116 and 186.

¹ *Amuktamalyada*, Canto IV Verse 285

of the poor. We have already seen, the interference of the King in putting down the tyranny of his governors, reducing the taxes whenever necessary and abolishing some obnoxious ones. His anxiety to foster trade and benefit the cultivator by improving the irrigation of the soil, we have noticed on a previous occasion. The benevolent policy and the religious neutrality of the monarch, we have had no opportunity to mention hitherto, and we give some concrete instances to illustrate our point. In 1368 A. D. Bukka I. reconciled the followers of the Jaina and Vaishṇava creeds.² Krishṇadēvarāya's munificent gifts to Śaiva and Vaishṇava temples without any distinction, at Kālahasti, Tirupati, Chidambaram, Bezwada etc. and the abolition of certain taxes on all Śaiva and Vaishṇava temples during his time, is also a well-known fact.³ He appears to have conferred grants also on the Jaina and Buddhist temples.⁴ A Jaina general and scholar Iruguppa Daṇḍanātha was the minister of Harihara II. *Dvaita* and *advaita* philosophers flourished in their Courts. The above instances prove to the hilt not only the benevolent neutrality but also their patronage of different creeds.

The King and His Titles.

Though the founders of the Empire, were content with the modest title of "*Mahāmaṇḍalesvara*", their successor Harihara II. bore the first Imperialistic title "*Mahārājādhirāja, Rāja-paramēśvara*". The Sāluvas who succeeded the Sangama Dynasty were credited with the titles of "*Dharaṇi-varāha*," *Misara-gaṇḍakaṭāri Sāluva*⁵ The Tuluva Emperors who succeeded the Sāluvas on the Imperial Throne held the following titles. Emperor Krishṇadēvarāya bore the following title at the time of his Coronation "*Śrī-manmahā-rājādhirāja-paramēśvara*"⁷ and subsequently "*Muru-rāyara-gaṇḍa* and *Yavonasthāpanāchārya*" in his Amarāvati Inscription.⁸ The *mahā-rājādhirāja-paramēśvara* title also was born by Achuyutā Rāya and Sadāśiva Rāya.⁹ At times *Śrī-vīra-prātāpa* or *Śrīvīra-Bhujabala* also was added to these titles. The titles that were born by them indicate only their indisputable sovereignty and their indomitable valour. None of the titles give him a military halo.

² *Ep. Carn.* vol. II, No 344

³ *Epigraphical Report* for 1904, Para 23

⁴ No 188 of 1901, *Epigraphical Report* for 1901

⁵ *Jour. Bo. Br R. A. Soc.* vol. Page 227

⁶ *Ep. Ind.* vol. VII Page 74

⁷ *Ep. Ind.* vol. I p. 362

⁸ *Ibid* vol. VII, Page 17

⁹ *Ibid* Vol. XIV. page 310

TWO COPPER-PLATE GRANTS OF THE SALANKAYANAS OF VENGI.

FIRST SET: A.

KANTERU GRANT OF VIJAYA SKANDAVARMAN.

LATE MR. K. V. LAKSHMANA RAO, M.A.

The earliest of the dynasties of kings, that Epigraphy has disclosed to us as having ruled at *Vēṇḡgi* in the Krishna district, is that of the *Śālaṅkāyana*s. The source of our knowledge of these ancient kings was hitherto only two¹ Copper-plate grants. I am therefore glad to announce that I have been able to secure two new sets of copper plate grants, of two different kings belonging to this dynasty. These plates were found, buried under ground, in a village called Kantēru, six miles from Guntur. I received them from a friend of mine.

The first of these, grant A, consists of four copper plates, $5\frac{1}{2}$ " long and $1\frac{1}{8}$ " broad. The upper or the first side of the first plate and the lower or the second side of the last plate are left blank. The writing is worn out at many places, though, with the help of a magnifying glass and the readings of the hitherto published *Śālaṅkāyana* plates, most of the indistinct letters can be made out. Of the four plates the second one is the thinnest and consequently a portion of it is broken. The edges of the plates are not raised into rims. These plates are held together by a circular copper ring $2\frac{1}{2}$ " in diameter to which a circular seal ($1\frac{1}{2}$ " in diameter) of bronze is attached. The figure and the legend on the seal have almost completely disappeared. The figure looks like that of a bull, the hump and some portion adjoining it being clearly visible.

The second of the plates which may be called the grant B, consists of four copper plates, each 5" long and $1\frac{1}{8}$ " broad. Only the first side of the first plate is left blank. These plates are all held together by a copper ring $2\frac{3}{4}$ " in diameter. The circular seal ($1\frac{3}{4}$ " in diameter) attached to this ring was hopelessly covered with rust, etc., when the plates first came to me and nothing was visible on it. But, by getting it cleaned continuously for several days and in several ways, I have been able to clean and expose the inner portion of the seal to a great extent. In the centre of the seal, we can now clearly perceive a beautiful figure, in relief, of a bull (Nandi) in crouching position. Below the bull and

1 The Kolleru Grant of Vijayanandivarman (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 175) and the Ellore Prakrit Grant of Vijayadevavarman (*Ep. Ind.* vol. IX. p. 66.)

along the edge of the seal, there appear some letters, which are so hopelessly worn out, that they could not be recognised even with the help of a magnifying glass. One of the letters appears to be *ra* and another *nu*. We are not therefore in a position to know what the legend on the seal was. Neither of the rings was cut when it reached me.

It is very fortunate, that we have been able to recognise the animal on the seal of the grant B. Of the four copper plates, we now have of this dynasty, none else except this grant has a seal which clearly shows the animal which represented the crest of the Śālaṅkāyanaś and hence its importance. Of the seal of the *Ellore Prakrit Grant*,² which may be taken as the earliest of the four, it is said "The seal is all but obliterated but a faint figure of a quadruped perhaps a tiger can be seen." The seal of the *Kolleru Plates*³ is lost, and seal of the *Kunteru Grant*⁴ is worn out and shows only a portion of the animal, which when compared with the figure on this seal, may be inferred to be that of a bull.

The alphabet of the two grants is of the same type and is known as the Eastern archaic species of the Telugu-Canarese script. This was preceded by the writing which was still more archaic and is to be seen now in the *Mayidavole*⁴ and the *Kondamudi Plates*⁵ from the Guñtur District, the Prakrit inscriptions of Amarāvati⁶ and the inscriptions of the Andhras⁷. Then this type is followed by the archaic writing to be seen in the plates⁸ of the Viśhṇukūṇḍins and first two kings of the Eastern Chalukyaś. All these three types form a variety called the "archaic variety" according to Dr. Bühler⁹. The letters in our plates closely resemble the letters in *Kolleru*¹⁰ and *Chikkulla*¹¹ plates and show a very slight variation from the letters in the *Prakrit Plates*¹² of Ellore. Final *m* is represented by a small *m* (Grant B, l. 9) which I believe subsequently changed into a *sunna*. It is this *sunna* which now represents *anusvara* in Telugu. In grant B, (l. 3) there is a special symbol to represent what is called in Sanscrit *Upadhmaniya*, i.e., *visarga* followed by *p* or *ph*. And it is specially noteworthy that this very symbol was adopted, in the latter period of the evolution of the Telugu-Canarese

2 *Ep. Ind.* vol. IX p. 56.

4 *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI p. 84.

6 See Burgess' Amaravati stūpa and *Ep. Ind.* vol. XV p. 258.

7 *Ep. Ind.* vol. VIII p. 59.

3 *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 175.

5 *Ep. Ind.* vol. V. p. 315.

8 Rāmācīrtham plates (*Ep. Ind.* vol. XI p. 134) Chikkulla plates (*Ep. Ind.* vol. IV p. 193) C. P. No. 7 of 1913-14 C. P. Nos. 11 and 12 of 1913-20 *Epigraphical Reports, Southern circle*.

9 *Indische Paleographie*, English Edition p. 70.

10 *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 175.

11 *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV. p. 193.

12 *Ep. Ind.* vol. IX p. 56.

alphabet, to represent the purely Dravidian consonant *ra* or (*bandi ra*). I believe that the symbol for *Upadhmanīya* fell out of use after some time, as the ordinary symbol for *visarga* began to represent all sorts of *visargas*; and when the Dravidian writers wanted a symbol for a sound which was particularly their own, they selected the unused symbol for *Upadhmanīya*.

The numerical symbol 12 occurs in line 10 of the grant B, the figure being represented by the juxta-position of 10 and 2. All the plates of both the grants are numbered, but the plates of the grant A are numbered on both the sides, like the pages of a modern book.

The language of both the grants is Sanscrit. It is prose throughout, except the usual laudatory and imprecatory verses that come at the end.

The grant A is given by the Mahārāja Śrī Vijaya Skandavarman, who meditates on the feet of holy Chitra-ratha-svāmin, who is the disciple of the venerable Bappa, (father) who is the most excellent worshipper of the holy one, who belongs to the family of the Śālaṅkāyanas. The donee was one Śivārya who resided in a village called Lēkumārī and who belonged to Maudgalya gōtra. A village called Chinnapura in Kudrahāra *viśhaya* was given in the first year of the king's reign on the full-moon day in the month of Vaiśākha. ..

The donor in the grant B is Mahārāja Śrī Nandivarman of Śālaṅkāyana family, who has all the titles of the donor in the grant A. To one Svāmī Chandra who was a brahmin of the Maudgalya gōtra and was famous, a piece of land measuring 12 *nivartanas* in the village of Kuruvāḍa which was in the Kudrahāra *viśhaya*, was given on a certain new-moon day.

The adjectives (or the titles) which the kings of this dynasty apply to themselves are somewhat peculiar and let us therefore try to interpret them as far as we can. The Śālaṅkāyanas call themselves *Bhagavat Chitraratha-svāmi-pādānuvṛhyātas*. It is therefore clear that Chitraratha was their tutelary god. Who was this Chitraratha? We know of a certain *Gandharva* of that name but we have not come across any dynasty of kings or any individual who had *Gandharvas* as their gods. Sanscrit lexicons¹³ give the word *Chitraratha* as a synonym for the Sun-god. I believe that the Śālaṅkāyanas worshipped the Sun-god under this name of Chitraratha. My conjecture seems to be confirmed by the representation of the Sun to be found on the seal attached to the grant B. There is a small circular projection on the outer side of the seal, which clearly represents the Sun. There is a similar projection on the head of the seal attached to the grant A, but it is not very clear.

¹³ See *Vachaspathyam*.

Sun-worship¹⁴ is prevalent in the Telugu country even now. I may here add that a small mound at Peda Vēgi is at present shown as the site of the ancient temple of Chitraratha svāmin.

Again the Śālaṅkāyanas call themselves *Bappa-Bhāṭṭāraka-pādābhaktas*. The name of Bappa occurs in the inscriptions of many dynasties, such as the Guptas, the Vākatakas, the Pallavas, and the Eastern Gāngas. It is therefore certain that it does not represent any ancestor. It is not a proper name. We must therefore take it to mean 'father'. Each king showed highest reverence to his father, who was generally his predecessor on the throne.

Next coming to the word *Śālaṅkāyana* itself, it is originally the name of a Vedic *ṛṣi*. In *Pravara kanda*¹⁵ we have *gotras* called Śālaṅkāyana. One belongs to *Āngīrasa gaṇa* and has the same *pravara* which the *Bhāradvāja* *gotra* has, viz., *Āngīrasa*, *Bārhaspatya*, *Bhāradvāja*. There is another *Śālaṅkāyana gotra* which belongs to the *Viśvāmītra gaṇa*, with the *pravara* *Viśvāmītra*, *Śālaṅkāyana* and *Kausika*. In the *gaṇapata* of Pāṇini we find the word *Śālaṅkāyana* in *Nadodi* (IV. 1.99) and in *Rajanyadi* (IV. 2. 33). There was a country called *Śālaṅkāyanaka* where the *Śālaṅkāyanas* lived (IV—2—53). It is not possible to know whether our *Śālaṅkāyana* kings of Vēṅgī ever claimed any kinship with the ancient *Śālaṅkāyanas* of whom Pāṇini speaks. A sanscrit lexicon of authority called *Medinī* gives Nandi or the sacred bull as one of the meanings of the word *Śālaṅkāyana*. From the figure of the bull found on the seal, we may infer that *Śālaṅkāyanas* considered themselves somehow connected with Nandi, the great bull of Śiva. We must also remember that some of the Pallavas had Nandi on their seals.

Vijaya Dēvavarman of the *Ellore Prākṛit Plates*,¹⁶ claims to have performed horse-sacrifices and to be a great *Māhēśvara* or the worshipper of *Māhēśvara* (Śiva). We do not find the claim to horse-sacrifices in any of the subsequent grants. In place of the epithet *Parama-Māhēśvara*, *Parama Bhāgavata* is substituted in the later grants. I am of opinion that the boast¹⁷ of *Aśvamedha* (horse sacrifice) started

14 See under "Salankayana" Angiras and Visvāmītra in Raghunath Bhaskar Godbole's *Bharata Varshiya Prachina Aitihasic Kosha* (Marāṭhi) where all the information from the various *Pravara Kandas* is given.

15 *Ep. Ind.* vol. IX p. 56.

16 I call this a boast because, except one or two of the members of the Gupta dynasty, none of the kings who boast of *asvamedha* were so powerful as to entitle them to perform such a sacrifice. If this was so with the members of the Imperial Gupta family much inferior was the status of the kings of other dynasties who claim to have sacrificed a horse.

17 There is a famous temple of the Sun at Arasavilli near Chicacole Ganjam District, with inscriptions dated S.S. 1068 and another in the Nellore District, (Ed.)

with the Imperial Guptas, and the contagion spread to the minor dynasties like the Chēdis, the Vākātakas, the Kaṭambas, the Śālaṅkāyans and others. The proximity in time of Vijaya Dēvavarman to Samudra Gupta's South Indian triumphal march, in my opinion, explains the insertion of the word *Aśvamedha-yājina* (l. 5) in the grant of Vijaya Dēva. He must have seen some of the Imperial grants with similar titles and coöly imitated them. Subsequent kings thought it, perhaps, too big a boast for the owners of a petty principality. Similarly the epithet '*Parama māhēśvarassa*' is from the Gupta Inscriptions. Because this epithet was changed into that of *Parama Bhāgavatasya* by the successors of this king, we need not infer that the later Śālaṅkāyanas changed their Śaiva faith and became Vaiṣṇavas. *Bhāgavata* did not necessarily mean in those days a worshipper of Viṣṇu, and the followers of Śiva also were called Bhāgavatas. We have the authority of the venerable Patañjali for the usage of the word *Śiva Bhāgavata*.¹⁸

Of the places mentioned in these grants, Vēṅgi is usually identified with a village called Pedda Vēgi near Ellore. Let us accept this traditional identity. But those who intend to make original research should not forget that there are altogether four places of this name in the Telugu country. Four places of this name are found in the Northern Circars. Two of these named Chinna Vēgi and Pedda Vēgi are situated close to each other, in the vicinity of Ellore; another is found at Chintapalli in the Guntur district; and the fourth is a deserted site, named Vēgipāḍu, in the Pōlavaram Zamindāri, to the north-west of Rajahmundry.¹⁹ The second place mentioned in our plates is Kudrahāra *vishaya*. This territory seems to have included in it the present tālūkas of Avanigaḍḍa (Divi), Bandar, Kaṭkalūr and Guḍivāḍa in the Kristna district. The place called Gūdūr near Masulipatam is identified with the city of Kudrahāra, Gudrava, Gudrahāra and Gudravāra of the latest inscriptions are identified with this Kudrahāra of the Śālaṅkāyanas. We may accept all these identifications tentatively. All the available evidence for these identifications is collected at one place by Dr. Dubreuil in his *Ancient History of the Deccan*.²⁰

Chinnapura of the plate A (l. 4) though named *pura* (i.e. a city) was *pallikā* (l. 9) or a small village. It may be identified with the present village of Chinnāpuram in Bandar taluk. If this identification is correct, it is very strange that this village should have continued to retain its name all these fourteen hundred years. It is not possible to identify Lōkumārī, the native place of the donee in grant A.

18 *Mahabhashya* on the *Sutra of Panini*, V. 2—1.

19 *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, vol. XI, p. 202. 20 Pp. 84—85

The village Kuruvāda mentioned in grant B. (l. 5) cannot also be identified. There is however a village called Kuravāka mentioned in the *Kollēru Plates*²¹ of Vijaya Nandivarman (l. 6). We do not know whether these two forms of names Kuruvāda and Kuravāka are the variations of the same name. Kuruvāda was however within Gudrahāra. We do not know whether Kuruvāda was within that district. It is probable that the donees in the *Kollēru Plates* were residing within the kingdom of the donor.

The dates of these grants can be determined approximately and only in relation to the other plates of the Śālaṅkāyanas. The *Prākṛit Grant*²² of the Śālaṅkāyanas, which was found near Ellore, is supposed to be the older of the two published grants. The donor of it is *Mahārāja* Śrī Vijaya Dāya varman, who is described as "the performer of the horse sacrifices, the Śālaṅkāyana, the fervent *Māhēśvara* who is devoted to the feet of the Lord (his) father, and who meditates at the feet of the holy Chitraratha-svāmin." The *Kollēru Grant* is issued by Vijaya Nandi varma, son of *Mahārāja* Chandravarma. The land given was situated within the Kudrahāra *vishaya*. Of our new plates, grant A is by Vijaya Skandavarman. The donor of grant B, is Śrī Nandi varman. There seems to be one more grant of the Śālaṅkāyanas. J. F. Fleet²³ in editing the *Kollēru Grant* says, "In Sir W. Elliot's facsimiles I have another copper-plate inscription of Vijaya Nandivarman and his *Yuva-Mahārāja*, whose name seemed to be Vijaya Tungavarman or Vijaya Buddhavarman . . . the language even is doubtful but seems to be Prākṛit or Pāli."

We have thus seven names of the kings of this dynasty:

- | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| A. Ellore Prākṛit Plates
(<i>Ep. Ind.</i> vol. IX. p. 56) | } | (1) Vijayadēvavarman |
| B. Kollēru plates.
(<i>Ind. Ant.</i> vol. V, p. 175) | | (2) Chandavarman; his son |
| C. Kantēru grant A | } | (3) Vijaya Nandivarman |
| D. Kantēru grant B | | (4) Vijaya Skandavarman |
| E. Elliot's unpublished grant
(<i>Ind. Ant.</i> vol. V p. 175) | } | (5) Nandivarman |
| | | (6) Vijaya Nandivarman;
his son |
| | | (7) Vijaya Buddhavarman. |

Though we are not able to construct a regular geneology of the Śālaṅkāyanas from the above information, we may attempt a tentative chronology of these kings. The Prākṛit plates may be safely taken to be elder than the Sanskrit ones and the word *Vijaya* may be considered as only an honourific prefix, and not an integral part of any proper name.

²¹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. V, p. 175

²³ *Ind. Ant.* vol. V p. 175.

²² *Ep. Ind.* vol. IX. p. 56.

I therefore take Vijaya Nandivarman of *Kolleru Plates* and Nandivarman of *Kanteru Grant B.* to be the same person. We may also add to these names, Hastivarman mentioned in the *Allahabad Pillar Inscription*²⁴ as the then king of Vēṅgi, presuming of course that he belonged to the family of the Śālaṅkāyaṇas. We can then arrange the chronology thus :

A.D. 350 Hasti varman	} <i>Allahabad Pillar Inscription</i> <i>of Samudra Gupta.</i>
„ 375 Vijaya Dēvavarman	
„ 400 Vijaya Nandivarman	} <i>Elliot's Unpublished Prakrit Grant.</i>
„ 425 Buddhavarman	
„ 450 Chandavarman	} <i>Kolleru Plates & Kanteru Grant B.</i>
„ 475 Vijaya Nandivarman	
„ 500 Vijaya Skandavarman	<i>Kanteru Grant A.</i>

The above six generations, from Hastivarman, ruled the kingdom of Vēṅgi for nearly one hundred and fifty years. We know this period because, about the year 350, A.D., Samudra Gupta claims to have conquered Hastivarman of Vēṅgi. And then we know from the *Chikkulla Plates*²⁵ that Vikramādhēndravarmān of the Vishnukundin family, was ruling at (Re)Dēndulūru near Vēṅgi and gifted away a village on the banks of the river Krishna, about the end of the fifth century A.D. It is therefore clear, that the Śālaṅkāyaṇas must have ceased to rule at Vēṅgi by that time. We may suppose that the last of the Śālaṅkāyaṇa kings. Vijaya Skandavarman was defeated by Vikramādhēndravarmān in or about the year 500. We have therefore to place the above six generations of the Śālaṅkāyaṇas within a period of 150 years (350—500 A.D.) The average for a generation thus comes to 25 years which is the generally accepted average for the unknown reigns of Indian sovereigns.

We need not stop with Hastivarman or the period of the Emperor Samudra Gupta. From the *Kondamuḍi Plates*²⁶ we are aware, that when those plates were issued, a king called Jayavarman of the Brihat

²⁴ Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions* pp. 1—21.

²⁵ *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV p. 193. As for the dates of the kings of the Vishnukundin family, see Dr. Dubreuil's *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 90 and my Article on the Telugu Academy Plates of Vishnukundin Mādāvarma III, in the *Journal of Letters Calcutta, University*.

²⁶ *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI p. 315

palāyana gōtra was reigning at Kūdūra in the Kūdūhāra vishaya i.e., in the very district in which the Śālaṅkāyanas subsequently ruled. As to the date of this king Dr. Hultzsch, who edited the Konḍamuḍi Plates (in *Epigraphia Indica* vol. V. p. 315) says:—"The alphabet of his inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava prince Śiva Śkanda varman who issued the *Mayidavolu Plates*. Further the language and phraseology of the inscription are so similar to the Nāsik inscriptions of Gautami putra Śātakarṇi (Nos. 4 and 5) and Vāsishṭhi putra Pulumāyi (No. 3). that Jayavarman's date cannot have been very distant from that of those two Andhra kings. The archaic Sanskrit alphabet of the seal of the new plates is corroborative evidence in the same direction."

It is thus evident that at about the middle of the third century the district of Kudrahāra was governed by a dynasty of kings known as the Bṛihat-palāyanas. The Śālaṅkāyanas therefore, must have superceded the Bṛihat-palāyanas at about the end of the third century. After the period of the Andhras, this district seems to have been, successively occupied by the Bṛihat-palāyanas the Śālaṅkāyanas, the Viṣṇu-kunḍins and the Chālukyas. The Pallavas proper, do not seem to have ever occupied this territory. In all their grants²⁷ found in the Northern Circars, Kamma-rāshṭra is mentioned as the district under their control. In one²⁸ Dhannakaḍa is also mentioned. Kammarāshṭra is the Kamma-nāḍu of the later period and is identical with the northern portion of the Nellore district and a part of the present Guntur district.²⁹ Any how the early Pallavas did not cross the Krishna river. The guesses of some historians that the king of Pishṭapura whom Samudra Gupta claims to have conquered was a Pallava, cannot be supported by any epigraphical evidence.

The Śālaṅkāyanas, who were certainly the contemporaries of the earlier Pallavas, seem to have enjoyed their small principality of Vēṅgī and Kudrahāra, independently of the Pallavas. This principality was a small one and could not have been more extensive than an average modern district. It was situated between the mouths of the two mighty rivers of the south, the Gōḍāvari and the Krishna. To the north-east of it was Kalinga, with its capital at Pishṭapura (Pithapur); to the south-east was the Bay of Bengal; to the south-west was the river Krishna and the kingdom of the Pallavas. It is not possible to ascertain how far it extended in the north-western direction between the two rivers or beyond

²⁷ Chandalur Plates of Kumaravishnu V. (*Ep. Ind.* vol. VIII p. 233 Ongodu Plates 1 and 2 (*Ep. Ind.* vol. XV p. 246)

²⁸ *Mayidavolu plates Ep. Ind.* vol. VI. p. 84

²⁹ *Ep. Ind.* vol. XV p. 252; also vide *Ep. Ind.* vol. IX. p. 56,

them. This principality consisted of two *vishayas* (districts), Vēṅgi and Kudrahāra. Of these Vēṅgi was identical with the taluks of Ellore, Ernagūḍem and Bhīmāvaran, and Gadrahāra included the taluks of Avanigaḍḍa (Divi), Bandar, Kaikalur and Gudivāḍa.

The principality of Vēṅgi had a fine sea-board and a famous sea-port. There were the two great rivers flowing on the north and south, which should have facilitated the trade and the traffic of the country. Dr. Dubreuil has shown³⁰ that Kūḍūra (or the present Gūḍūru) was the same as the port of Koḍḍūra mentioned by Ptolemy of the second century and that the ships which wanted to go the country of gold (Khryse), i.e., the Indo-China peninsula (Burma, Malacca, Cambodia, Annam) started from this port. The place now called Ghantasāla was a great mart and was called Konṭakossyla by Ptolemy. So the port of Masulipatam, though under different names has been playing an important part in the sea-trade of Southern India.

At Ghantasāla, which is between Guḍūru and the mouths of the Krishna river, a Buddhist stupa has been discovered.³¹ We can therefore infer that this part of the country was once under the influence of Buddhism. We can see the influence of this religion still lingering in the two Prakrit grants found in this region, the Konḍamuḍi plates of Brihatpalāyana Jayavarman and the Ellore plates of Śālaṅkāyana Vijaya Dēvarman. The religious language of Buddhism was Prakrit or Pali.

I strongly believe that Śālaṅkāyanas were some how related to the Pallavas and hence were left alone unmolested by the Pallavas, who were certainly the more powerful of the two. It may be that these two dynasties had a common ancestor or that they were related to each other by marriage alliances. I have three reasons for supposing so. The Pallavas claim³² to belong to the *Bhāradvāja-gotra*, which has the *Pravara* of Āṅgīrasa, Bārhaspatya, and Bhāradvāja. And as I have shown above, Śālaṅkāyana is a *gotra* belonging to the Bhāradvāja clan and has the same *pravara*. Then both these dynasties, which were contemporary had for their crest the bull (*Nandi*). The seal attached to our *Kanteru Grant B* becomes thus very important in connecting these two families. Above all, the similarity of names of the kings of these two dynasties is a very strong reason to believe that these families were connected. The names of Skandavarman, Nandivarman and Buddhavarman found in the Śālaṅkāyana plates are found repeated several times in the genealogies of the Pallavas also. Dr. Dubreuil has given a geneology and the approximate dates of the Pallavas at page 70 of his

³⁰ *Ancient History of the Deccan* pp. 86—88,

³¹ See *Indian Buddhist Antiquities* by A. Rea.

³² See *Mayidavole Plates* and other inscriptions of the Pallavas.

Ancient History of the Deccan. In a period of 250 years, beginning with 300 A.D. and ending with 550 A.D., we have four Skandavarāmas two Buddhavarāmas and two Nandivarāmas. This similarity of names cannot be accidental. The repetition of the same name in both the families for several generations must be due to their alliance and the respect and love, each family felt for the members of the other.

Text. 1

First Plate, Second Side.

- 1 स्वस्ति । विजयवेङ्कयाः । भगवन्निबन्धस्वामि
- 2 पादांमुध्यातस्य वप्पमंदारक पादं भ
- 3 कर्त्तव्यं शालङ्कायनस्य महाराज श्री विजय

Second Plate, First Side.

- 4 स्कन्दवर्मणो [वचनात्कु*] इहा² र चित्र³ पुरे
- 5 ग्रामेयकाः वंक्तव्याः [11*] अस्य सामि रस
- 6 कुलं गीक्ष श्री यशोमिदृद्वये एतस्मै

Second Plate, Second Side.

- 7 मीद्रस्यस गीत्राय लेकुमारी ग्राम वा
- 8 स्तब्धाय शिवार्थ्याय संवर्ष परिहारण
- 9 सांपलिका दत्ता [11*] [त⁴द्विदत्ता*] [म⁵वद्वि] र⁶पूर्व [म*]

Third Plate, First Side.

- 10 [स*]मर्ष्य वया साधु प्रेमणो कर्त्तव्यमिति [11*]
- 11 अपि च संवर्ष नियोग नियुक्ता योक्तक
- 12 विषयपति मिश्रैः सापलिका परिहर्तव्या [11*]

Third Plate, Second Side.

- 13 [प्रवर्द्धमान*] श्री विजयराज्य संवत्सरे प्र
- 14 धमे वैशाख पौर्णिमास्यां दत्ता पट्टिका [11*]
- 15 बहुभिर्ध्वसुधा दत्ता बहुभि आनुपालिता [1*]

1 From the original plates in my collection

2 These two letters were clearly seen when I made my first transcript but were subsequently lost in getting the plates cleaned

3 This may be read as चित्तपुरे or चिन्तपुरे or चित्तपुरे because the ~~चित्त~~ practically makes no difference between त and न

4 Only, the secondary signs of इ-ि (gud) of the second and third letters and the *dirgata* of the third are visible.

5 More than half of the upper portions of these three letters are visible.

Fourth Plate, First Side.

- 16 यस्य यस्य [यदा भूमि] स्तस्य तस्य तदा
 17 पलं । षष्टिवर्ष सहस्राणि स्वर्गे क्रीड
 18 [ति भूमिदः।*] अक्षेप्ता चानु मन्ता च तान्ये
 19 [व नरके*] वसेत् [॥]

TRANSLATION.

Ll. 1—5. Hail ! The villagers of Chinnapura in Kudrahāra (vishaya) are to be informed thus by this command, from the victorious Vēngī, of Mahārāja Śrī Vijaya Skandavarma, who meditates on the feet of the holy Chitraratha-svāmi, who is a devotee at the feet of the venerable Bappa (father), who belongs to the family of the Śālāṅkāyanas.

Ll. 5—9. With a view to increase the prosperity of our family (Kula) and clan (gotra), this village has been given by us, with immunity from all the taxes, to Śivārya, residing in the village of Lēkumāri and belonging to the Maṇḍgalya gotra.

Ll. 9—10. Knowing this, you are to do your duty properly, and give possession of the village (to him) with affection and love.

Ll. 11—13. This village is to left alone by all the respectable officers, ministers, agents and heads of the vishayas. ..

Ll. 13—15. This charter has been given on the full-moon day of the month of Vaiśākha in the first year of our Victorious reign.

Ll. 15—17. Land has been given in charity by many and it has been protected by many. He who is the owner of the land for the time being enjoys the fruit of the charity (even though given by his predecessors).

Ll. 17—19. The giver of land lives gaily in Heaven for sixty thousand years. He who confiscates or assents to such confiscation shall dwell in Hell, for the same period.

KANTERU GRANT OF NANDIVARMAN B.

Text I

First plate, Second side.

- 1 स्वस्ति विजय वेङ्गीपुरातः गवच्छितरथ
 2 अस्मि पावतुभ्यामो नमः भद्रास्तु नमः

Second plate, First side.

- 3 अस्तुः परमभागवतः सा (ल) कृत्य
 4 नो महाराज श्री चन्द्रिका (रे*) कुद्राहरे²

Second plate Second side.

- 5 विषये कुरुनाभमो मुमुक्षु³ सहित
 6 प्रमेयकाणां ज्ञापयति (॥*) स्वस्ति । अस्माभिः

Third plate, First side.

7 ब्राह्मणाय मौद्गल्यस्य गोत्राय

8 प्रसिद्धाय स्वामिचन्द्राय अस्मत्कुल गो

Third plate, Second side.

9 (ब धर्म यशो) भिवृद्ध्यर्द्धम् अस्मिन्ग्रामे द्वादश

10 भूमि निवर्त्तनानि प्रदत्तानि (॥) तदवेत्य⁴

Fourth plate, First side.

11 (अ*) मास्या म्पाट्टिका दत्ता ॥ बहुभि र्वसुधा दत्ता

12 बहुभि श्रानुपालिता न यस्य यस्य यदाभूमि

13 स्तस्य तस्य तदा फलम् (१*)

Fourth plate, Second side.

14 षष्टिवर्ष सहस्राणि स्वर्गे क्रीडति भूमिदः

15 आक्षेप्ता चाभिमन्ताच तान्ये व नरके वसेदिति (॥*)

Ll. 1-6. Hail ! From the victorious Vēñgīpura ! Śālañkāyana Mahārājā Sri Nandivarama, who meditates on the feet of the holy Chitrarathasvami, who is a devotee at the feet of the venerable Bappa (father) and who is the most excellent worshipper of the holy one;—commands the villagers of Kuruvāḍa in the Kudrahāra *vishaya* (thus):—

Ll. 6-11. Hail ! With a view to increase the prosperity of our family (*Kula*), clan (*gotra*) and merit (*dharma*), a piece of land in this village measuring 12 *nivartanas* is given by us to the famous Brahmin Svāmichandra of the Maudgalya *gotra*. This charter is given on the New Moon-day.

Ll. 11-15. (The usual verses as at the end of grant A.)

1 From the original copper plates in my collection.

2 This word was read as Kudubara in the Kolleru plates by Dr. Burnell (*South Indian Palaeography* p. 135) and by Dr. Fleet (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V p. 175). The latter put an interrogation after the letter *da*, But Dr. Hultzsch has read it correctly as shown by him in a foot-note in *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV p. 193.

3 This is a peculiar word; its meaning is not known and there is a difference of opinion as to its reading. This word occurs in the Kolleru as well as in the Ellore Prakrit Plates. Burnell has read it as *munyodu* in the *South Indian Palaeography* (p.). Dr. Fleet has a big note about it (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 176) and suggests in the end that it may be *matyadi*. Dr. Hultzsch who has edited the *Ellore Prakrit Grant* has read it as *muluda*. Any how the reading and the meaning of this are doubtful.

4. I think some portion of the grant containing injunctions to the officer, with words such as *Sarva niyoganiyuktayuktuka vishaya pati misraih pallika pariharene* were omitted by mistake by the writer.

TELUGU ACADEMY PLATES OF SAKTIVARMAN II.

BHAVARAJ V. KRISHNA-RAO, B.A., B.L.

I edit this inscription through the kind courtesy of Mr. Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu, President of the Society, who has supplied me with excellent ink-impressions of the plates, at my request. These plates were noticed by the Government Epigraphist in his Annual Report on *South Indian Epigraphy* for the year 1913-14 on page 86, in para 10 and numbered as C. P. No. 8 of 1913-14.

The plates which contain the subjoined grant originally came into the possession of Mr. Jayanti Ramayya Pantulu, President of the Telugu Academy in or about 1913, and since then they have been in the Telugu Academy and have become its property. It is not known, however, where-from and by whom these plates were first brought to the notice of the President of the Telugu Academy, but I remember Mr. Ramayya Pantulu telling me once that they were discovered in Timmāpuram, in the Pithapuram Zamindari, Gōdāvari district.

The plates are five in number, hung, on a ring the ends of which were secured in a circular seal which contains in relief countersunk on its surface the legend "*Tribhuvanāṅkuṣa*". It is not known whether the ring was cut by the time the plates reached the present owner. The plates measure $9\frac{2}{5}$ " \times 5"; the edges of the plates are slightly raised into rims, so as to protect the writing on them. Except on the first or the upper side of the first plate there is writing on both sides on all the plates; the last or the fifth plate, too, contains four lines of writing on the outer side. Except on the last plate on its outer side and on the second side of the first plate the writing throughout has been well preserved; only the last lines of the grant written on the second side of the fifth plate have become worn out by rust.

The inscription runs into 104 lines and is written in the transitional Telugu alphabet of the eleventh century A. D. The writing bears a close resemblance to that of the Kōrumilli and the Nandamapūṇḍi grants of Rājārāja.¹ This is shown clearly for example by the two forms of *mu* in lines 43 and 52. The final *m* is not used at all and in its place the *anusvāra* has been substituted. The use of the nasal *n* is still to be seen.

1 *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XIV, p. 48, and *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IV, p. 300 respectively.

in words like *Duṣyantah* (l. 8), *lōkāntara-m* (l. 20) *narēndra* (l. 50), *sakalān-dharīṛim* (l. 54) and *nadanah* (l. 62), but at the same time it is also represented by an *anuvāra* in several places. The difference between the secondary forms of *a* and *ā*, *i* and *ī*, *u* and *ū*, and *o* and *ō* is not kept up uniformly. In one case the long *u* is represented by the long *a* as in *Śatrān* (l. 51). The writing may be said to be careless for the scribe left out many letters and words here and there rendering the task of restoration of the correct text that might be in the mind of the composer of the grant, rather difficult. The language employed throughout in the grant is Sanskrit, which is partly in prose and partly in poetry, except the portion containing the description of the boundaries of the village granted (ll. 89—97) which is in Telugu and Sanskrit prose mixed.

The orthography calls for a few remarks. It may be noted that a consonant besides being doubled as usual after the secondary form *r*, is also doubled in one instance after an *anuvāra* for *e. g.*, *paṁccavimsati* (l. 47). Again *ri* is used in one place for the secondary form of the vowel *r* for *e. g.*, *kritya* for *kṛtya*, in line 87. The name of the donor of the grant and that of the name-sake of his ancestor, is written as Śattivarama (ll. 63, 50, and 51) instead of Śaktivarma. Śakti in the compound word *ānanta-śakti* is written as *ananta-śatti* in line 63. The vernacular pronunciation or probably the prakrit form of Yuddhamalla as Juddhamalla may also be noticed in line 45. The symbol *ra* called *bandi ra* in Telugu is used in the following cases "nadumantibāṛina ēru" (l. 61), *Cheruvu*" (l. 62), 'Bārasivāḍa-pariti' (l. 95) and lastly 'polagarusu' (ll. 95-97), in the Telugu portion of the grant.

This is the only copper plate grant of the Eastern Chalukya king Śaktivarman II., son of Vijayāditya VII. and Mādavamahādēvi., that has been found till now. This prince is known to us from the Ryāli plates of Vijayāditya VII. as having reigned for one year only after the death of Rājārāja, in or about 1061 A. D. The present record, like the other grants of the dynasty, commencing from the Raṇastipūṇḍi Grant of Vimaladitya,² opens with the usual Pauranic or legendary account and geneology of the Chalukyas, and then gives in detail, following the practice of the earlier records of the family, the duration of the reign of each king from Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana to Rājārāja, uncle of Śaktivarman II., the donor of the sub-joined grant. This inscription is an important one for more than one reason. It contains new facts about the early kings of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty which were not known to us before.

In the first place there is a statement in line 47, that both Dānārṇava and Ammarāja II. killed each other's sons. Unfortunately for

² C. P. Nos. 8 & 9 of 1923—24. (See *Rep. on Ep.* for 1923—24 p. 77.)

³ *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI. p. 368.

us the text affords us considerable difficulty, being full of mistakes, in restoring the correct reading. The Government Epigraphist who examined the inscription remarks that, 'Just before the *interregnum*, the two brothers Dānārṇava and Amma II. are stated to have murdered the sons of each other,' and then adds, "this statement partly explains the necessity for an *interregnum* which followed their rule in the Vēngī country". These murders appear to have happened in the last days of Ammarāja II., for immediately after this statement comes the mention of the fact that Ammarāja II. protected the earth for twenty-five years and then his half-brother (*dvaimāturaḥ*) reigned for three years. Accepting the remarks of the Government Epigraphist, I wrote on the history of the reign of Ammarāja II., in my *History of Rajahmundry*⁴, as follows:

"But soon after the expedition against the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa III., Ammarāja II. returned home and once more took over the administration of the kingdom. From this time forward the amiable relations between the brothers seem to have been a little ruffled, and we do not hear of the amity any more between them. Dānārṇava seemed to have turned hostile to Ammarāja II. during the closing years of latter's reign. The records of the later kings of the house clearly speak that Amma's last years were marred by cruel atrocities and cold blooded murders of the princes of the blood royal, by the king and his half-brother, which probably, resulted in the death or expulsion of Ammarāja II. from the country in A.D. 970, and the death of Dānārṇava, three years later, in a protracted civil war. Ammarāja II's father-in-law Nṛpa Kāma, lord of the Lake Country (*Saro-nātha*), his mother-in-law Nāyamāmba (both of whom were held at one time in great esteem by the king) and his brotherinlaw, Bhāskara surnamed *Gaṇḍanā-rāyaṇa*,—all of them seem to have fallen out and changed colours. Bhāskara deserted the cause of the king and joined Bādapaṇḍya, eldest son of Yuddha maṭṭa II., who was then engaged in an attempt to invade Vēngi with the assistance of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in order to gain the kingdom of his father to himself. The causes for this desertion of the king's own kith and kin during critical times on the one hand, and the growth of ill feelings between the king and his half-brother Dānārṇava on the other, are not known. Ammarāja II. had probably estranged his own brother and all his kinsmen in his queen's side by his foolish acts.

"The events of the last days of Ammarāja II., that partly explain the causes for the successful invasion of Vēngi and the capture of the throne by Bādapaṇḍya and Amma's death or expulsion from the country in the struggle that ensued, may be gleaned from the surrounding circumstances. In the struggle between the brothers, the country became probably

divided, and the invader Bādapa and his Rāshtrakūṭa allies, aided by the traitor Bhāskara could easily seize the throne. But Bādapa at any rate could not have won the kingdom so easily as he said. The civil war following the invasion appears to have dragged on for three years, at least, from A.D. 970 to 973, the period which is usually assigned to Dānārṇava. This period of civil war, which is said to be the reign of Dānārṇava seems to indicate that Dānārṇava was then carrying on the struggle against Bādapa, while Amma II. was either dead or expelled from the country. We have also a statement in the Ārambāka Plates of Bādapa that he (Bādapa) conquered the kingdom from Ammarāja himself, which fact seems to suggest that Bādapa did not recognise Dānārṇava as king at all. It is this reign of Bādapa which lasted probably for 27 years that was regarded as the period of *interregnum*, the period during which the kings of the later years stated, 'there was no king over Vēngi'. The statement meant only that the senior branch of the dynasty which was restored to the throne by the accession of Śaktivarman I. in A.D. 999 did not recognise the rule of the younger branch of the dynasty represented by the descendants of Yuddhamalla I., the traitor brother of Guṇaga Vijayāditya III..

I suggested that the causes for the '*interregnum*' or more properly speaking for the invasion of Bādapa, might be in the beginning, a quarrel between Amma II. and his brother Dānārṇava, and later, dissensions between Amma II. and his queen's relatives, Nṛpa Kāma and his son Bhāskara. For all these dissensions in the royal family, I said, there might be, perhaps, something of the nature of disgraceful intrigue in the life of Amma's favourite mistress Chāmekāmba and the son of Dānārṇava or Amma himself, like that of Chitrāngi and Sārangadhara of the story connected with the reign of Rājarāja Nārēndra, in the last days of Ammrāja's reign

In writing the above I had in my mind not only the statements recorded in the present grant but also in the Ārambāka Plates of Bādapa, 5 the Guṇḍugolanu Plates⁶ and the Kaluchumbarru Grant⁷ of Ammarāja II. I put these four records together and constructed a possible turn of events of the last days of Amma II.

It is stated in the present grant that Rājarāja and Vijayāditya VII. were the sons of Vimalāditya, though born of different mothers. We know from Nanniya's *Mahābhārata*, that Rājarāja was the eldest born and his mother was Kundavāmbā, daughter of Rājarāja Chōla the great. Vijayāditya's mother is said to be Mēḍavamahādēvi, also, a

5 *Ep. Ind.* vol. XIX. p. 137 ff.

6 *Ind. Ant.* vol. XIII. p. 348.

7 *Ep. Ind.* vol. VII. p. 177 ff.

Chola princess, but her parents' names are not mentioned (l. 56). The Government Epigraphist reads the name of queen Mēḍavamahādēvi wrongly as Mālavamahādēvi, in this record.⁸ It is further stated in this grant that Vijayāditya VII. conquered the Vēngi kingdom during the absence of his half-brother (*dvaimāturah*). Immediately after this, follows another statement that Vijayāditya VII. placed his son Śaktivarman II. on the throne of Vēngi out of abundance of affection for his son (*putra sneha*) after destroying or defeating all his enemies. It is interesting to know who these enemies were, that Vijayāditya fought in order to make his son king of Vēngi. It is probable, these enemies were no other than Vijayāditya's half-brother Rājarāja and his son Rājendra Chōḍa, who after wards came to be known as the illustrious Kulōttunga Chōla Dēva I. This conquest of Vēngi and the usurpation are said to have happened after Rājarāja had reigned for forty-one years. The events of the last days of Rājarāja as described in our grant are in full accordance with the tradition extant in the Āndhra country, regarding the incompleteness of Nanniya Bhaṭṭa's *Mahābhārataṃ*. Tradition says that during the last days of Rājarāja, the country was very much disturbed on account of some invasion by the enemies, and as a result of that, soon drifted into a war, and that both Rājarāja and his poet laureate died about that time in the midst of those troubled times.

We do not know the causes for the invasion of Vēngi at the fag end of Rājarāja's reign by Vijayāditya VII. It seems certain that Vijayāditya VII. made use of the opportunity to invade the country, afforded by the absence of the king who had probably gone on an expedition to a distant country. And in this he must have been assisted by Sōmēśvara I. the Western Chalukya king of Kalyān, whose vassal he was, ruling over the Nōlambayādi *vishaya*, since his first exile in 1035 A. D. circa. About this time (A.D. 1060) Sōmēśvara I. invaded the Chōla dominions, penetrated as far as Kānchi and stormed the city taking away large booty and plunder.⁹ At about this time, too, Sōmēśvara I. probably induced Jagadēkabhūṣana Dhārāvāṣadēva, the Sinda king of Chakrakūṭa Maṇḍala in the Southern Kōsala country, to invade the kingdom of the Eastern Chalukyas in the north. Rājarāja and his son Rājendra Chōḍa¹⁰ might have been engaged in the campaign against Dhārāvāṣadēva at about this time, and Vijayāditya VII. taking advantage of his brothers absence from the country and helped by Sōmēśvara I. invaded and conquered Vēngi.

8 *Ep. Rep.* for 1918-14 p. 86.

9. Carn.-desa Inscr. vol. I. p. 144; *Ind. Ant.* vol. V, p. 318; and *Vikramanḱa deva Charita*, Introd. p. 27.

10 It was about this time that prince Rajendra Choda, afterwards the famous Kulottunga Chola Dēva I. stormed the fortress of Chakrakuta (Sakkrakottam) and captured the elephants of Vairāḡaram (Wairgarh). See the remarks of Rai Bahadur Hira Lal in *Ep. Ind.* vol. X p. 27.

It is interesting to find from a grant recently discovered and edited by my friend Mr. R. Subba Rao, M. A., in the pages of this *Journal* (vol. p. 277), that this was not the first time that Vijayāditya VII invaded and occupied Vēngi. The grants states as follows:—(lines 59–65)

“तस्य मुम्मडिभीमस्यसुतः कृतमति र्भृहाराजराजाह्वयो राजा द्वादशाब्दान्धरामपात् ॥

तं राराजंनृपतिं निर्घाट्य भुवं प्रसह्य विजयादित्यः ।

विमलादित्यतनूजस्य द्वैमातुरो महीधराज्यम् ॥

श्रीमान्शाके समौधे दृगिषु निधिमिते कर्किगे कर्कशांशौ

शुद्धात्मा शुद्धपंचम्यदितिसुतदिने सूर्यम शौर्यशाली ।

कन्यालभ्रेतिधन्वा शशिकुलतिलको राजमार्त्ताण्डसूनु

वर्वेक्षीसाम्राज्यपट्टं स्म वहति विजयादित्यभूपः प्रतापी ॥


Thus it is said that Rājarāja, son of Mummaḍi Bhīma, i.e., Vimalāditya who is entitled to be called *Mahārāja* protected the earth for twelve years; then Vijayāditya (VII.) son of Vimalāditya and a brother of Rājarāja born a different mother (*dvaimāturaḥ*) having expelled Rājarāja forcibly, obtained the kingdom. This valourous prince, Vijayāditya, son of *Rājamārtāṇḍa*, the foremost among the race of the Moon, crowned himself king of Vēngī on *aditisuta-dina* (Thursday, the 5th *tithi* in the bright fortnight after the sun had entered the zodiacal sign *Karkātaka* i.e. in the solar month of *Karkātaka*, in the *Saka Samvat* 952, (represented by numerical word symbols, *dyk* = 2, *iṣu* = 5 and *nidhi* = 9, i.e. = 952) in the *Kanyā lagna* when the *nakṣatra* was *Hasta*, which corresponds to Thursday, the 9 July 1030 A. D.,¹¹ and this date falls in the 8th year of Rājarāja's reign. Thus, from this it is clear that Vijayāditya actually became king after Rājarāja had protected the country for full twelve years, even though his actual coronation took place four years previously. We know that Rājarāja ascended the throne on Thursday, the 16th August, A.D. 1022, and by adding 12 years to this date we arrive at 16th August, A.D. 1034: thus the usurpation by Vijayāditya VII. should have taken place only after the last mentioned date. His crowning himself to the kingdom of Vēngī four years prior to this date might be only a mark of his revolt against his brother and desire to become the king of Vēngī himself, with the assistance of some of the discontented nobles of the court like the Malaya chief Bhīma Bhūpa mentioned in this Pāmulaṅkā grant.¹² The interval of four years between the actual date of

11 I am indebted to Mr. V. S. Prakasarao, B. A., L. T. who greatly assisted me in calculating the date. This date and the date further below have been calculated with the help of L. D. Svamikanu Pilla's *Indian Chronology*.

12 Above vol. II. p. 277–289.

Vijayāditya's coronation in A. D. 1030 and forcible seizing of the throne by defeating and driving out Rājarāja at the end of the latter's 12th year of reign, was probably filled with civil war with varying success on either side. It does not appear either from Vijayāditya's Pāmulaṅkā Plates or the present record how long Vijayāditya VII. reigned after this event. It is probable that he did not reign long and that he was again attacked shortly afterwards, defeated and lastly banished from the country by Rājarāja. For the subjoined grant and other records clearly state that Rājarāja reigned for full forty-one years and this statement is in support of the view that it was an uninterrupted reign. If Vijayāditya VII. conquered and crowned himself king of Vēṅgi, his authority did not extend beyond a limited area, and his reign did not exceed at any rate for more than a year. It is interesting to note that this revolt, and the usurpation by Vijayāditya VII. are not mentioned in the record under review. This is perhaps due to the fact the Vijayāditya VII.'s escapade at that time was after all a disgraceful affair.

Śaktivarman's mother Māḍava mahādēvi is said to be a princess of the Haihaya family. I give below the geneolgy for the sake of convenience so far as this king and his immediate ancestors are concerned.



Śaktivarman II. according to this grant bore the surnames *Samaraika bhātrava* and *Satyāśraya*. He seems to be quite a youthful prince nay, even a boy at the time of his accession to throne, from the way in which it is said that he was crowned to the kingdom by his father out of affection (*putra-sneha*) after conquering all his enemies for him. Elsewhere in the Ryāli Plates¹³ which were issued by Vijayāditya VII. himself twelve years after he had assumed the reigns of sovereignty, the king deeply mourns the untimely and tragic death of his young son Śaktivarman II. on the battle field when he was hemmed in on all sides, and compares him to the epic hero Abhimanyu.

The object of the grant is record the gift of the village of Numiyavāḍa in the Prōlunāṇḍu to Aḍapa Appana, an officer of the king on the occasion of a lunar eclipse, that came sometime after the

king's coronation. He is said to belong to the *Kāśyapa* gōtra and *Apastamba* sūtra. He is referred in most respectful terms by the king, and described as one who took great pains *kṛta-kṛtsi* in his cause as if it was own. He is the son of Kaṇṭhena, and son's son of Drōṇa, who was praised by all learned men as an excellent person. Appana's mother's family name is mentioned as *Benti kula* through curiously enough her name itself is omitted. It is doubtful from the absence any statement or indication whether the donee, Adapa Appana was a *Brāhmaṇa* after all. We may take him either to be Kṣatriya or more probably as a Śūdra, for we have till this day Śūdra families with the surname *Adapa*. The famous chiefs, Era Bommū Nāyaka and China Bommū Nāyaka of Vēlūr of the time of, Achyutarāya, Sadāśivarāya and Rāmarāya of Vijayanagar, belonged to the Adapa family, and the Telugu word *Adapa* means "the bearer of the betel leaf bag for the king or any high personage". The Adapa family was very illustrious in Vijayanagar History not only for their valour but also for their patronage of Appaya Dikṣita and brahminical learning of the Saivaite school. These naiks of Velur also belonged to the *Kāśyapa* gōtra.

This inscription is dated and contains the date of the king's coronation. Śaktivarman's coronation took place on Thursday, the 2nd *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the month of Tula, *Śaka Samvat* 983 expired expressed in numerical word symbols, *guna* = 3, *vasu* = 8, *nidhi* = 4 = 983, which corresponds to Thursday, 18th October A.D. 1061. The lunar eclipse may also be calculated and thus we will be able to know exactly the date on which the present grant was made.

Numiyavāḍa, the village granted cannot be identified now. There is no village of that name in Prōlunāṇḍu which corresponds to the modern Taluk of Peddāpuram, portions of Rāmachandrapuram, Cocanada and subdivisions of Pithapuram and Tuni, of the East Godavari District. The village was probably deserted and hence gone out existence in course of time. It might be that the village Timmāpuram, at which the plates were found, lying between Pithāpuram and Cocanada, was the original Numiyavāḍa. Some of the villages mentioned as boundaries cannot also be identified. Bārasivāḍa and Chandūru are not to be seen. Chandūru may be Chandurti, but the village is a little far away from Timmapuram. Even the small local streams mentioned as boundaries may not be existing today. The Telugu portion of the inscription contains many archaic words (for example, *pariti* = stream); and it is this aspect that is really interesting to the philologist and linguist, interested in the study of the archaic Telugu.

The executor of the grant is Kaṭakādhpati Nārāyaṇa, the poet who composed it is Kavi Kāmana. The scribe is said to belong to *Viśvakarma kula*, but his name is obliterated.

TEXT.¹*First Plate, Second Side.*

- 1 ²श्रीधान्नः पुरुषोत्तमस्य महतो नारायणस्यप्रभो न्नाभी पंकरुहाद्भूव
 2 जगता स्रष्टा स्वयंभूस्ततः । जज्ञे मानससूनु रत्रिरित यस्तस्मान्मुनेरत्रि तः सोमोवंशक-
 3 र स्सुधांशु रुदितः श्रीकण्ठचूडामणिः ॥ (१*) ³तस्मादभूत्सुधासूते [ब्बुधो बुधनुत
 (स्ततः*)⁴] । जातः पुरुवरु
 4 नामचक्रवर्ती सविक्रमः ॥ (२*) तस्मा दायु स्ततो नहुष स्ततो ययातिश्चक्रवर्ती
 वंशकर्त्ता । ततः पूरु
 5 रिति चक्रवर्ती । ततो जनमेजयोऽश्वमेधवित युगकर्तेति । (ततः) प्राचीशः ततः सैन्य
 6 याति स्ततो हयपतिस्ततः सार्वभौम स्ततो जयसेन स्ततो महाभौम स्तस्मा
 7 ⁵दशानकः ततः क्रोधानन स्ततो देवकि स्तस्मादृभुक स्तस्मादृक्षक स्ततो मतिवर स्तत्
 8 यागयाजी सरस्वतीनदीनाथः । ततः कात्यायनः ततो नील स्ततो (दु*)व्यन्तः तत्सुतो ।
 9 ⁶गंगायमुनातीरे यदविच्छिन्ना निधाय यूपान् क्रमशः कृत्वा तथाश्वमेधभ्राम
 10 महाकर्मा भरत इति योलभत ॥ (३*) ततो भरताद्भूमन्यु स्ततोः सुहोत्र स्ततो ..
 11 हस्ती ततो विरोचन स्तस्मा दजमिल⁹ स्तुतः संवरण स्तस्यच तपन सुताया स्तप
 12 त्याश्च सुधन्वा । ततः परीक्षित् ततोभीमसेनस्ततः प्रदीपनस्ततः शन्तनुस्ततोविचित्र-

Second Plate, First Side.

- 13 वीर्य्य स्ततः पाण्डुराजः¹⁰ पुत्रास्तस्य च धर्मज भीमार्जुन नकुल सह(दे*)वाः[।*]
 पंचेन्द्रिय व
 14 त्पंचस्युः¹¹ त्रिविधेय ग्राहिण स्तत्रः ॥ (४) ¹²येनादाहि विजित्य ¹³काण्डव मथो
 गाण्डीविना वञ्चिणं युद्धे पाशु
 15 पतास्र मन्धक रिपोश्चालाभि दैत्यान् भङ्गन् । इन्द्रार्द्धासनमध्यरोहि जयिना यत्कालि
 केयादिकान्

1. From the ink impressions supplied to me by Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu, B.A., B.L.

2. Sloka Sârdulavikrīḍita

3. Sloka Anusṭup.

4. The letters in the brackets were first written, then struck off and then inscribed again between lines 3 and 4. Hence they are not very clear.

5. Read दशानकः

6. Sloka Aṛya.

7. Read यदविच्छिन्नं

8. The Visarga is superfluous.

9. Read दजमिल

10. Sloka Aṛya

11. The Visarga is superfluous 12. Sloka, Sârdulavikrīḍita. 13. Read साण्डव

- 16 जित्वा स्वैरमकारि वंशविपिनच्छेदः कुरुणं विभोः ॥ (५*) ततोर्जुना दभिमन्यु स्ततः
परीक्षित् ततो जन-
- 17 मेजयैस्ततः क्षेमुक स्ततो नरबाहन स्ततः शतानीक स्तस्मा दुदयन स्ततः प्रभृतिस्व¹⁴
विच्छिन्न सन्ताने
- 18 ¹⁵स्तयोष्यासिंहासनासीनेष्वेकाम्र चं षष्टि(च*)कवर्त्तिष्ठुगतेषु¹⁶ तद्वश्योविजयादित्यनाम
19 राज[1*] विजिष्वतया¹⁷ दक्षिणापथं गत्वा त्रिलोचनपल्लव मधिक्षिप्य दैवदुरीह
20 या लोकान्तरमगमत् । तस्मिन्संकुले पुरोहितेन वृद्धामाल्यैश्च सार्धमन्तर्वत्नी तस्य महा
21 देवी मु (डिवेमु*)¹⁸ नामाग्रहारमुपगम्य तद्वास्तव्येन विष्णुभट्टसोमयाजिनादुहितृ
निर्व्विशेषम
- 22 भिरक्षितासती विष्णुवर्द्धन नन्दनमसूत । सा तस्य च कुमारस्य मानव्यसगोत्र हारिती
23 पुत्र द्विपक्ष(गोत्र*)क्रमोचितानिकर्माणि क(1*)रयित्वा तमवर्धयन् । स च मात्रा
विदितवृत्ता
- 24 न्त स्मृनुर्निर्मात्य चलुक्यगिरौ नन्दां भगवतीं गौरीमाराध्य कुमारनरनारायण मा-

Second Plate, Second Side

- 25 तृ गणांश्च संतर्प्य श्वेतातपत्रैक शंखपञ्चमहाशब्द पालिकेतन प्रतिडक्का¹⁹ व
26 राहलाञ्छन पिच्छकुन्त सिंहासन मकरतोरण कनकदण्ड गंगायमुनादीनि स्व
27 कुलक्रमागतानि निक्षिप्तानीव साम्राज्यचिह्नानि समादाय कडंब गंगादि भू
28 मिपा भिर्जित्य सेतुनर्ममदामध्यं सार्धसप्तलक्षं दक्षिणापथं पालयामास ॥ ²⁰तस्या
29 सी द्विजयादित्यो विष्णुवर्द्धनभूपतेः । पल्लवान्वय जाताया महादेन्याश्च नन्दनः ॥ (*६)
30 तत्सुतः पालिकेशि लभ स्तपुत्रः कीर्त्तिवर्म्मा । तस्य तनयः (1*) श्रीमातां सकलभू²¹
31 वन संस्तूयमान मानव्यसगोत्राणां हारिती (पु*)त्राणां कौशिकीवरप्रसादलब्ध
32 र(1*)ज्यान(1*)मातृगणपरिपालितानांस्वामिमहासेनपादानुध्यतानांभगवन्नारायण प्रसा
33 द समासादित वरवराहलाञ्छने क्षण क्षण बजीकृ²²ताराति मण्डलाना मन्त्रमेधा
34 बभूथ स्ना[न*] पवित्रीकृत वपुषां चालुक्यानां कुलमलंकारिणोः सत्याश्रयबलभे
35 द्र स्तस्य भ्राता कुब्जविष्णुवर्द्धनोष्ट्रादशवर्षाणि वेंगीदेश मपालयत् [1*]तदात्मजो ज
36 यसिंहबल्लभ स्यात्क्षिशतं । तदनुज इंद्रराजः सप्तदिनानि । तत्सुतो विष्णुव-

14. Read 'प्रभृतिस्व' 15 Read 'ष्वयो' 16. Read गतेषु 17. Read विजगीषतया

18. The letters 'डिवेमु' have been left out carelessly by the Scribe.

19 Read 'प्रतिडक्का' 20 Sloka Anushtup. 21 Read 'भुवन' 22. Read 'वशीकृता'

Third plate, First side.

- 37 द्विनो नववर्षाणि तत्सुनुर्मगि युवराजः पञ्चविंशतिं तत्पुत्रो जयसिंहस्तयो .
 38 दश तदवरजः कोकिलः षण्मासान् तस्यज्येष्ठभ्राता विष्णुवर्द्धन²³ स्तमुच्चैर्दय सप्त
 39 विंशतमब्दान् तत्पुत्रो विजयादित्य भट्ट[1*]रकोष्टादश । तत्सुतो विष्णुवर्द्धनः षट्त्रिं
 40 शतं तत्तनयो नरेन्द्रमृगराजाष्टचत्वारिंशतं तत्पुत्रः कलिविष्णुवर्द्धनो ष्यद्वे
 41 वर्षं तत्सुतो गुणगाविजयादित्य श्रुतुश्चत्वारिंशतं । तद्भ्रातुर्विक्रमादित्यस्य तन
 42 य आलुक्क्यभीम क्षिंशतं तत्सुतः कोल्लभिगण्ड विजयादित्यः षण्मा
 43 सां तत्सुतु रम्मराजः सप्तवर्षाणि तत्सुतं विजयादित्यं चालुमुष्ठा
 44 द्य ताडपोमासमेकं तं जित्वा चालुक्क्य भीमतनयो विक्रमादित्य एकादश मासा
 45 न् तत्ताडपराजसुतो जुद्धमल्लः²⁴ सप्तवर्षाणि[1*] तं²⁵ युद्धमल्लं परिहृत्य देशात्पिष्ट्वैत
 46 रेवामपि शात्रवाणां क्षमामम्मराजानुज राजभीमो भीमस्समा द्वादशरक्षति स्म॥[७*]
 47 ²⁶दानार्णवाममृपयो द्वे स्तत्तनयौ रपत²⁷ । कनीयानम्मनृपातिः क्षमामब्दानि
 पञ्चविंशति ॥ [८*]
 48 ²⁸द्वैमातु रोम्म राजस्य राजभीमसुतो महीं । समर

Third plate, Second side

- 49 क्षत्समारितस्रः श्रीमान्दानार्ण²⁹बोनृपः । [९*] ³⁰अनुदानार्णवा दासीदेव
 दुश्चेष्टया ततः
 50 सप्तविंशति वर्षाणि वैगिभूमि रनायिका³¹ । (१०*) ³²अत्रांतरे दाननरेन्द्र सूनुः
 श्री शक्तिवर्मा
 51 सुरराट् सुधर्मा [1*] य इशौर्ष्यं शक्या विनिहत्य शत्रून् स द्वादशाब्दा न्समरक्ष
 दुर्वीम् ॥ [११*] ³⁴तत स्तदनुजो
 52 वीरोन्मिलादित्यभूपतिः । महीमण्डल सांभ्राज्य³⁵ प्राज्यलक्ष्मी मुदादवात्³⁶ ॥ (१२*)
³⁷तेजोयदीय

23 Read 'विष्णु'

24 Read युद्धमल्लः

25 Metre Ingravajra

26 Metre sloka Anushtubh

27 The reading here is extremely doubtful and

incorrect. I restore the reading of the text thus tentatively 'द्विस्तनया वपतताम्'

28 Metre Anushtubh

29 Read 'दानार्णवा'

30 Metre Anushtubh

31 Read 'नायिका'

32 Metre Indravajra

33 Read 'शक्ति'

34 Sloka Anushtubh

35 Read 'साम्राज्य'

36 Read 'मुदादवात्'

37 Metre Vasantatilakā,

- 53 माखिलःक्षितिपालमौलिमालाखभादमलरत्नरुचिच्छलेन[*]पातिस्म सप्तससमा स्सकला
 54 न्धरिर्त्रि [भीम*]प्रतापमहितोबिहदांकभीमः॥(१३*) तस्य³⁸ श्रीमा नात्मजो राजराजो
 55 राज्ञेज अन्द्रवंशाग्रगण्यः । सैका चत्वारिंशतः वत्सराणि क्षेणीं रक्षादक्षणो र
 56 क्षतिस्म ॥ [१४*] अपिच । विमलादित्या³⁹ षोडान्वयैकलक्ष्म्याश्च मेडव महादेव्याः।
 अजनि ज
 57 यश्री नित्योविजयादित्यो नरेश्वर स्तुत्यः ॥ (१५*) परोक्षे⁴⁰ राजराजस्य भ्रातु द्वैमातु
 रस्य य(:*) । प्र
 58 त्यप्रही न्महीराज्यश्रियं वीरश्रियायुतः ॥ (१६*) यशशैर्येण⁴¹ हरिं जयेनविजयं स
 59 त्येन धर्मात्मजं । चारित्र्येणमनुं समिद्धमहसाभानुं धिदाभागं सौंदर्येण
 60 मनोभुवं भृशमघःकुर्वन् जगद्गीतया । कीर्त्या निर्मलया विभाति विजयी चा
 61 लुक्य वंशोत्तमः ॥ [१७*] तस्य श्रीदीयतस्य हैहयकुल क्षीराब्धि लन्वो⁴² दय
 इश्रीमूर्तिस्सम

Fourth plate, First side.

- 62 पादि मादवमहादेव्याश्चयोनन्दनः।अष्टाभिःकविभिर्द्दिगंतविशृतो द्रष्टोभिमामु⁴³श्चिरं यो
 63 व्याथात्तमनन्तशक्ति⁴⁴सहितः श्रीशक्ति⁴⁵वर्म्मानृपः ॥ (१८*)⁴⁶गुणवसुनिधि संख्यां
 याति श(1*)काब्दवर्गे दिव
 64 सकृति तुलास्थेयो दधाद्राज्यलक्ष्मी । स्थिरतरमनुराधा शुक्लपक्षद्वितीयायुजि सुरगुरुवा
 65 रे कुंभलग्नेभक्तिः⁴⁷ ॥ (१९*)⁴⁸योरुह्य स्वकमादरादतितरामुत्तुंगसिंहासनं । पित्रा
 निर्जित शत्रु
 66 वेण विजयादित्येन नित्यौजसा । पुत्रस्नेहरसप्रपूर्णा⁴⁹ मनसा साम्राज्य⁵⁰ पटुंभुवो ।
 67 यस्मिन्नप्यिति⁵¹मायुगं समवत व्यायेन सर्वाः प्रजाः॥(२०*)⁵²यस्मिन्क्षति राजानि
 68 धरणीं धर्मरतिर्भयं पापात् । अन्योन्यः प्रियकार्येष्वासक्ति स्संतत प्रजाश्च
 69 भवति ॥(२१*)⁵³व्याप्ते यस्यसमुज्ज्वलेन यशसा दिक्चक्रवाले हिमप्रवृत्तयुते ता
 70 रहारहसित क्षीरोदपूराश्रियो । सैन्दूरै रतिसांद्ररेणुपटलैः कुंभस्थले पटु

38 Metre *Indravajra*.

39 Metre *Giti*.

40 Metre *Anushtubh*.

41 This and the following sloka are in Metre *Sardulavikridita*.

42 Read 'लब्धो'

43 The reading is doubtful

44 Read 'शक्ति'

45 Read 'शक्ति'

46 Metre *Malini*

47 Read 'लग्नेभक्तिः'

48 Metre *Sardulavikridita*.

49 Read 'प्रपूर्णा'

50 Read 'साम्राज्य'

51 The reading is doubtful. 52 Metre s'oka *Aryagiti*. 53 Metre *Sardulavikridita*.

Fourth Plate : First Side.

[illegible]

Fourth Plate : Second Side.

[illegible]

- 71 के । प्वाल्लिपंति पुनःपुनश्च हरिता माधोष्णावारणान् ॥ (२२*) ⁵⁴मधुरा मधुरालापा
 72 लंकालंकारहारिणी।काञ्चीकाञ्चीकलापाभीनुनुरक्तामहिमाहिषी^{54b} ॥ (२३*) ⁵⁵यस्यश्रीसम
 73 रैकमैरव विभोदोदोदण्डांको⁵⁶ यक्षप्रक्ष स्नेहित हस्तिमस्तक गलन्मास्तिष्क खार्दा शया
 74 रद्राः पक्षपटलीसा. वियती व्यावद् चक्रांश्चालति । योशाववभयाश्च योविह.

Fourth plate, Second side.

- 75 रतियुद्धेषु वीरश्रियः ॥ (२४*) सर्वलोकाश्रय श्रीविष्णुवर्द्धन महाराजाधिराज राजपरमे
 76 श्वरः परमभट्टारकः परमब्रह्मण्यः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसत्याश्रयदेवः ॥ सा सर्वलो
 77 काश्रय श्रीविष्णुवर्द्धन महाराजाधिराजो राजपरमेश्वरः परमभट्टारकः परम
 78 ब्रह्मण्यः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसत्याश्रयदेवः ॥ प्रोलुनाण्डु विषयनिवासिनो राष्ट्र
 79 कूट प्रमुखान् कुटुंबि नमस्सर्वान् ⁵⁷नसमाहूय मंत्रिपुरोहित सेनापति युवराज
 80 दौवारिक प्रधानसमक्ष मिथ्यमाज्ञापयति यथा । ⁵⁸आपस्तंबान्वय (:*)
 81 श्रीमानासीत्काश्यपगोत्रजः । द्रोण इत्युन्नति[त*]स्थानं योमान्यः पुण्यचारिभिः[२५*]
 82 तत्सूनुः पण्डितस्तुत्यः कन्देनाख्य सुधीरभूत् । यः कुन्दचंदनांभोज चारुकी
 83 त्तिर्विभोरवान् ॥ (२६*) आसीत्तस्यसती साध्वी धर्मपत्नी पतिव्रता । भिदाः बंति
 कुलोत्तंसा याशीलादि
 84 गुणान्विता ॥ [२७*] जातस्तयोः ⁵⁹पण्डित पारिजातो विनीत इत्यार्यकुले प्रतीतः ।
 मुख्यस्सतां स
 85 नमति रर्पनाख्यो यः पुण्यकर्मा सुजनाग्रगण्यः ॥ [२८*] आर्जितः⁶⁰ श्री मातायेन
 स्वयं कष्ट[:*]
 86 स्वकीयवत् । ⁶¹वन्नभिश्च सुहृद्भिश्च संविभज्योपभुज्यते ॥ [२९*] तस्मै सुर्धाय
 स्मद्भक्ताय अ
 87 डप अर्पन नान्मा भवद्विषये नुमियवाड नामग्राम (म*) प्रहारीक्रिय ⁶²क्रित⁶³केशि

54 Metre *Anushtubh*

54a Read 'कलापाभानुरक्ता महिषीमही'

55 Metre *Sardulavikridita*.

56 The text in lines 73 and 74 is full of mistakes as some letters have been

omitted and therefore could not be corrected. 57 Read 'सर्वान्समाहूय'

58 This and the following slokas in ll. 82—84 are in *Anushtubh* metre.59 Metre *Upajaiti*.60 Metre *Anushtubh*

61 Read 'वन्धुभिश्च'

62 Read 'कृत्य'

63 Read 'कृत'

Fifth plate, First side.

- 88 त्वनिमित्ते सोमग्रहणनिमित्ते धारापूर्वक मस्माभिर्दत्तमिति विदितमस्तुवः । अस्य
 89 क्षेत्रेऽस्मानः (ः*) पूर्वतः चंदूरिद्वय गट्टु[ट्ट*]नु नानजिकनूमयु दूबयु चंदूरिमा
 90 न्यमुन पडुमटि दूबयु । सीमा आग्नेयतः चंदूरिमान्यमुन पडन्दमान्य
 91 मुनयु नडुमंबाळीन ए००० । सीमा दक्षिणतः पडंदमान्यमुन उत्तरमुन ए
 92 ०००नु दीनि पडुमटि जुव्विन्नानुनु । सीमा नैरुत्यतः पडंदपलिचे०००नुनकु कोनमु
 93 न इसुमु । सीमा पश्चिमतः वच्चरवाडितूर्पुन रेवटिइसुमुनू तंगगुण्टतू
 94 पुन गडुनु यिंदुलरेवडुनेल तूर्पुन पोलगरुसुनु इंदुल यैन दूस
 95 रिय तूर्पुन कालिय । सीमा वायव्यतः नुवुरुबारसिवाड पळीति दक्षिणमुन
 96 कालिय । सीमा उत्तरतः बारसिवाड दक्षिणमुन पोलगरुसुनु पोनु बळीतिपोल
 97 मुन *पोलगरुसु चं दूरिवट्ट(?) दक्षिणमुन कट्टुनु यिन्दुलगडवु दक्षिणमुन जुव्विन्नानु
 98 नु । सीमापेशान्यतः चंदूरिरेवडुनेल पडुमटि इसुम सीमा ॥ अस्योपरिनकेन चिद्धा
 99 धार्कत्तन्या यः करोति सपंचमहापातकयुक्तो भवति । तथाचोक्तं भगवान् व्यसे
 ..100 न ॥ ⁶⁴स्वदत्तां परदत्तोवा योहरंत वसुन्धरां षष्टिवर्षे सहस्र[1*]णि विष्टा[यांजाय*]

Fifth plate, Second side.

- 101 यतेकिमिः ॥ (३०*) बहुभिर्बसुधादत्ता बहुश्चानु पालिता । यस्य यस्य यदाभूमा
 102 स्तस्यतस्य तदापलमिति ॥ (३१) [जा]त श्री ⁶⁵समरैक भैरव (नृपोयस्य⁶⁶ प्रनस्य
 भिष्टाज्ञप्तिः क
 103 टकाधिपो क...यि ता नारायणाग्न्यो कविः । कामानात्म्य विश्वकर्मोद्भव शलः पट्टद्व
 104 यान्....यदैयमे तदा तत सा...गुर्वीसितं शा[सनम्]] * ॥ (३२*)

TRANSLATION.

Lines 1 to 54 are identical with the text of the Korumilli Plates of Rajaraja, (*Indian Antiquary*, vol. XIV, p. 48ff.)

V. 14. His (Vimalāditya's) son, Rājarāja, the foremost of the race of the Moon (*Chandra vamsa*) protected the earth (kingdom) with great ability for full forty-one years.


V. 15. And to Vimalāditya was born, from his queen Mēḍava-mahādēvī who was like the goddess Lākṣmī to the ocean (family) of the Chōlas, Vijayāditya, who was praised by all kings.

⁶⁴ This and the following slokas are in *Anushtubh* metre.


⁶⁵ Metre *Sardulavikridita*.

⁶⁶ Lines 102—104 are unintelligible except for a few words here and there, rendering the task of correcting the text difficult.

Fifth Plate: First Side.



Fifth Plate: Second Side.



Ll. 75—80. He is the *Sarvalōkāsraya*, Śrī Viṣṇuvardhana, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Paramēśvara*, *Paramabhāṭṭāraka*, *Paramabrahmanya*, *Paramamāhēśvara*, *Satyāśrayadēva*. He, the *Sarvalōkāsraya*, Śrī Viṣṇuvardhana, *Mahārājādhirāja*, *Paramēśvara*, *Paramabhāṭṭāraka*, *Paramabrahmanya*, *Paramamāhēśvara*, *Satyāśrayadēva*.—having called together the cultivators and the heads of the villages (*Kuṭumbinaḥ* and *Raṣṭrakūṭa pramuḥkhān*) to assemble, commands thus, in the presence of *mantri*, *purohita*, *senāpati*, *yuvarāja*, *lauvārika* and *pradhāna*:—

V. 25. There is born in the family of Āpastamba (follower of the *sūtra* of Āpastamba) and in the Kāśyapagōtra, Drōṇa who was a very noble person, and of very high position and great character. His son was Kanṭhena, who is praised by learned men, as a virtuous man.

V. 26. His consort, born of the *Bentikula*, was a virtuous and devoted wife, a noble lady, whose fame was as pure as the white lotus.

V. 27. To them was born in the *Ārya kula*, like the very heavenly flower *pārijāta* for the learned men, one, who is praised by all as great and one who is intent on doing meritorious deeds, and who is the foremost among the best men.

V. 28. He, who has taken pains for the cause of all as if it was his own, he, who enjoys his wealth along with his relatives and friends dividing it equally between them and himself.

Ll. 86 to 88. To him, Aḍapa Appana, who has taken great pains in my cause, who is my devoted and loyal servant, the village of Numiyavāḍa in your district (*Prōluṇāṇḍu*), has been given away by us after converting it into an *agrahāra*, on the occasion of the lunar eclipse, with the libation of water. Let this be known to you all.

Ll. 89—98. The boundaries for the village granted are : On the east, hill containing bamboo shrubs *Nāma* and *Dāba* of Chandūru, On the south-east, a stream flowing between fields (*mānyamu*) of Chandūru and Paḍanda (village?) On the south, stream flowing into the field (*mānyamu*) of Paḍanda. To its north and to its west a *Ficus infectoria* (*Juvvi*). To the south-west, Sands at the end of the Tank of Paḍadamṣali (village). On the west, alluvial soil to the east of Babbaravāḍi (village) and a small stream flowing on the east of Tūṅgagunṭa (village) and a canal flowing to the east of the boundary of Naḍugūru (village). On the north-west, the mountain torrent of Nuvuru Bārasivāḍa and to its south, the boundary fields cultivated by the mountain stream and a band of Chandūru on its south and the intervening land between them and a *Ficus infectoria* (*Juvvi*) tree to its south. On the north-east, alluvial soil of Chandūru and sands to its west.

Ll. 88—102. Usual imprecatory verses.

V. 32 (Here the writing is all mutilated.) This grant was executed by the Kaṭakādhpati, Ka...ya and composed by the poet Nārāyaṇārya and inscribed by Ammaya, son of Komāna of the Viśvakarma *kala*. etc

POSTSCRIPT

I felt a doubt whether my restoration of the text, in line 47 above was sound and correct, since writing the above. I think the line can be restored in the following manner only: दानार्णवाम्म नृपयौ द्वौतत्तनया वपात् । This restoration seems to be reasonable and probable. If the poet or the composer of the grant wanted us to understand that there were murders of each other's sons, he would not have inserted this fact in metre along with the fact that "the younger prince Amma (II.) ruled the kingdom for twenty-five years." He would have put this statement in a separate sentence after stating that Ammarāja reigned for twenty five years, with some amount of clearness of expression. As the text now is, the sequence is that Rāja Bhīma had two sons, Dānārṇava and Ammanṛpa, and of these, the younger one Amma protected the earth for twenty five years. Immediately after this follows another anuṣṭubh which records that Dānārṇava reigned for three years afterwards. As the text stands, there is no place for stating that Amma and Dānārṇava murdered each other's sons even before the fact of Ammarāja's reign is stated. I believe that the restoration made by me originally is untenable and hold that there were no murders by Dānārṇava and Amma, at any time in the reign of the last named prince. The text as restored now by me clearly states: "He (Raja-Bhima II.) had two sons, Dānārṇava and Ammanṛpa, and the younger Amma protected the earth (kingdom) for twenty five years." I do not think in the light of this new interpretation even, I need alter my conclusion about the last days of Amma II that, "for some unknown cause all the relations of Amma on his queen's side, led by Gaṇḍa Nārāyaṇa Bhāskara changed colours and joined Bādapa who invaded Vēṅgi and conquered it with the help of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas."

HISTORY OF PADMANAIKS.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

An old Palmyrah leaf Manuscript, containig 25 leaves, each measuring $14'' \times 1\frac{1}{6}''$ in size and containing 5 or 6 lines of Telugu matter written on both the sides, was presented 2 years back to the Museum of the Society by Mr. Vemury Viswanadha Sarma, M. A., L. T. It reveals the origin and the history of the Padmanaiks. It opens with the description of the exploits of Kākati Pratāpa Rudra Mahārājah and states that by serving him, the *Kāpus* became *Velama-Kammās*, and finally came to be styled *Padmajas* or, *Padmanaiks*. They are called *Velamas* whose warlike qualities are much praised in the work. 77 Gōtras are stated and they are named mostly after places. The titles of these 77 Gotras and the reasons for the same, are next explained. These appear more or less boastful and vain. One title, *Kākati Raja Rājya Sthāpanāchārya* is, however, significant. The terms, Kākati and Kākita, are both used. The Gōtra named Pallava and the titles Pallava Chakravarti and Pallava Trinētra are also significant showing the attempts made by the Chiefs to connect themselves with powerful ruling tribes of the past. The title '*Āhavamalla Rājya Sthāpanācharya*' might probably refer to the help given by these Pādmanaiks to the Western Chalukyas, before the Kakatiyas became independent and powerful. After the fall of the Western Chalukyan power, they seem to have become the loyal vassals and ruling chiefs under the Kakati Mahārājahs.

After describing the titles of the 77 Gōtras of the *Velamas*, the work states that the *Padmajas* or *Padmanaiks* numbering 77, loyally served their master Pratāpa Rudra Kākatēswara and when influenced by the King of Gauḍa, the Yavanas, the Marātas, the Gurjaras, and the Maḷavas, besieged Orugallu or Ēka Śīla Nagaram (Modern Warrangal) they collected a force of 9 lacs and drove them off. Hence, for their courage and warlike deeds, the Kakati King gave them several presents and titles.

The remaining part of the work is purely descriptive of the qualities and duties, of the *Velamas* or *Padmajas*. The ruler of Dehli, the Turki ruler of Bhamini Kingdom, the Kalinga ruler, the Pandyan and the Bengal ruler, all alike, are described as having been terrified by the deeds of Padmanaiks.

The work closes with a poetic description of Orugallu, the Capital of Pratapa Rudra who is said to have ruled for 36 years and worshipped Sreesaila Mallikārjuna.

Originally, a certain Baḍabāgni Bhaṭṭa wrote this work and Bhimana prepared a Sanskrit Version of it.

TWO NEW COPPER PLATE INSCRIPTIONS OF VIJAYADITYA I.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

History of the Plates.

These two new sets of copper plates, with rings and seals in tact, discovered somewhere in West Godavari District nearly two years' back, were placed in my hands by the learned President of the Society, Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu B.A., B.L. for decipherment and publication in this *Journal*, and hence, I express my deep debt of gratitude to him for the kindness. The two sets are now deposited in the Telugu Academy, Cocoonada of which our learned President is the Chairman. The impressions of the two sets of plates, which were taken by me after a difficult process of cleaning, are now deposited, as usual, in the Museum of the Society, for kind perusal of Members and Public. Of the two sets, the first is bigger and heavier than the second. Its weight is $97\frac{1}{2}$ tolas, while that of the second is $52\frac{1}{2}$ only. The diameter, of the rings of both sets is $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches and of the seals 2 inches and the circumference 1 foot, each. The length and breadth of a plate of the first set are 7" and $3\frac{1}{4}$ " respectively, while those of second set are $6\frac{3}{4}$ " and 3" respectively. The thickness of a plate of the first set is $\frac{1}{4}$ inch, while that of the second is $\frac{1}{8}$ only. Hence, the great difference in weight between the two sets.

Each set contains 3 plates, and near the left hand edge centre of each, a hole is made, through which passes the ring, the two ends of which are soldered into a circular Seal, which contains a Crescent at the top, the legend '*Śrī Tribhuvanāmkūṣa*' in the middle, and an expanded Lotus flower at the bottom.

A Previously discovered Copper Plate Inscription of the King.

So far, only one copper plate grant of this king was discovered and noticed in the *Annual Report* on South Indian Epigraphy for 1916-1917 on pages 11 and 116. This record of Vijayāditya Mahārāja contains also 3 plates measuring $6\frac{5}{8}$ " \times $2\frac{2}{3}$ " each. The Seal of that record also contains a Crescent at top, the legend *Śrī Tribhuvanāmkūṣa* in the middle and an expanded Lotus at the bottom, with an *Amkūṣa* on the side. The same geneology of the Eastern Chālukya line, as is found in the present plates, viz., Maṅgiyavarāja and his son Viṣṇuvardhana and his son, Vijayāditya, is given. The king granted "*Śakharāmbu*", a village in Velnāḍu *Vishaya* (Guntur District) to a resident of Kāraṁchēḍu named

Dēvaśarmā of Hāriti Gōtra, on a lunar eclipse day in *Uttarāyana*. The date 763 A.D. is ascribed to the grant.

Alphabet and language of the Plates.


The first side of the first plate and the second side of the third plate in both sets, do not contain any writing as it is their purpose to serve as covers. Excepting the first side of the third plate in the second set which contains only 6 lines, all other sides contain 7 lines of matter, each, so that the first set contains 28 lines, while the second only 27 lines.

The alphabet used in both sets of grants is old Telugu or, *Tel-Kannada Lipi*, as it is called. The language of both sets is in Sanskrit prose, except for the usual Vyāsa Slokas found in the concluding portion of each grant. The first set is not written so correctly or carefully as the second one. In the first set, first plate, second side, in lines 2, and 6, *pūrṇānusrvāra* is omitted after *putrānā*, *rājyānā* and *kulamala* while in the same set, second plate, first side, in line 3, the letter *na* is not inscribed after the word, *niravadhyōdāragu*. In both the sets, the use of *anunāsika* in the place of *pūrṇānusrvāra* is resorted to, as is usual in all the grants of the age, vide, *lañchana*, *Srīmañgi*, *Maṇḍala*, *Kuṭumbina*, *Kṣētram*, *Dattam*, *Pañcha* in lines 4, 6, 7, 14, 20, 21 and 23.

In the first set, in lines 15, 20, 21 and 28, and in the second set, in lines 11, 15, 18 and 19, the peculiar letter called Śakaṭa rēpha or Baṁdi *ra* is inscribed. The earliest form of the letter is found here. It is marked 'r' in the 2 inscriptions.

History of the King's Line.

The following geneology of the Eastern Chālukya line is known to us from the copper plate grants of these kings published so far :—



The Donor according to his 3 Sets of Plates, has got the titles, *Samasta bhuvanāśraya*, *Chakravarti*, *Parama-brahmanya*, *Parama-māheshvara*, *Vijayasidhi*, *Bhattāraka*, *Vikramarāma*, *Tribhuvanāmkusa*, which clearly show that he attained Sovereign power over the whole of Vēṅgi-Rājyam extending from modern Vizagapatam District to Nellore District, along the east coast, and in the interior, to the region where the tributary Mūsi joins the main river Krishṇa. While the Bay of Bengal bounded on the east, the Eastern Gaṅga kingdom lay to the north, the Pallava to the south and the Rashtrakūṭa to the west. The last power just then rose by a successful revolt against the Western Chālukyas and even tried to extinguish the Eastern Chālukyas. From the Alas Plates of Govinda II, published in Ep. Indica, Vol 6, P. 208, we learn that that Rāshtrakūṭa king invaded in A.D. 769 the dominions of the Eastern Chālukya king Vijayāditya I. and gained a victory near the confluence of the rivers Mūsi and Krishṇa and forced the Eastern Chālukya king to cede the Western Districts along with a heavy war fine. All the same, it would appear that Vijayāditya I. could hold his own ground, as attested by the several grants he made and the great titles he bore. For thirty years or more, this dynastic war was continued in successive reigns in both the dynasties until the Rashtrakūṭas were finally exhausted and forced to give up their dream of extirminating the Eastern Chālukya line of Vēṅgi.

Subject-matter of the Plates.

The first 12 lines in both the sets are practically one and the same, and again the first sides of the last plates in both sets are also identical, except for the additional mention in the very last line of the first set, of the name 'Bhaurama', the executor of the Plates. Lines 13 to 21 naturally differ in both the sets as they mention the different districts and villages, the heads and cultivators of which were assembled and informed of the king's order. Lines 15 to 17 are somewhat common as the donee in both grants is one and the same. The village Vargīparu, the gōtra Bhāradvāja, and the geneology of the Donee Mādhavaśarmā II., who is the son of Śivaśarmā and grand son of Mādhavaśarmā, as mentioned in both sets of the plates, are practically identical but the accomplishments of the Donee are differently described in the two sets and from this difference, an important conclusion must be made, viz., the second set is later in date than the first because by the time the first set was written, the donee was able to recite only two Vedas. In other words, the same Donee belonging to the same place receives at first, on the occasion of the lunar eclipse, the grant of *Aṣṭakhandika* extent of field and at a later period, on the occasion of solar eclipse, the grant of *Dvādaśakhandika* extent of field, free of all taxes and obstacles, in both cases. In lines 19 to 21 in the first set and 18 to

20 in the second set, the boundaries of the fields granted are given with great detail in old Telugu language. In the first set, the field granted lies to the *west* of Gommaḷūru village in Gudrahāra Viṣaya (modern Gudivāda and Bandar Taluks in Kistna District). In the second set, the field granted lies to the *east* of Dinakaḍu village in Prakuṇōra Viṣaya (modern Guntur Taluk). In both the cases, the resident cultivators and village heads of the concerned villages were summoned and informed of the fact of the grants and of the conditions under which they were made, so that proper protection and care might be bestowed on them.

In the concluding portions of both sets, the usual Vyaśa *śloka*s are mentioned so that future kings might reap all the benefits by preserving them and suffer disgrace and ruin by destroying them.

TEXT OF FIRST SET OF PLATES.

First Plate, Second Side.

1. Svāsti Śrīmatām sakala bhuvana saṁstūyamāna Mānavyasa gō
2. ttrāṇām Hāritiputrāṇā(m) Kauśikīvaraprasādabharājyāna(m) mātṛgaṇa
3. paripālītānām Svāmi-Mahāsenapādānuddhyātānām BhagavanNārāyaṇa-
4. prasāda-samāsādita vara-Varāha-lāṁcchanē kṣaṇa-kṣaṇa vaśīkr-
5. tārāti-maṇḍalānām Aśvamēdhāva bhṛtha snāna-pavitrikṛta-vapu
6. śām Chaḷukyanām kula-mala(m) kariṣṇo Śrī Maṅgi Yuvarājasya-priya
7. nija-bhuja-bala-vārjitāsēṣa-bhūpāla-maṇḍalasya anēka-tulādhṛta


Second Plate, First Side.

8. suvarṇa-dāna-varddhitāva-dāta-kīrttiḥ Sarvvalōkāśraya Śrī-Viṣṇuvardha
9. na Mahārājasya priyatanayah sapratāpāvanata samasta-sā
10. manta-chakraśchakravarttiḥ lakṣaṇōpētō niravadyōdāra gu(ṇa)gaṇālām
11. paramabrahmaṇyaḥ parama Māhēśvarō mātā pitṛ pādānu dhyāta
12. sSamasta-bhuvanāśraya Śrī Vijayāditya Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśva
13. ra-Bhaṭṭarakah Gudrahāra viṣayē Gommaḷūru-nāma-grāma-madhivasatō
14. Rāṣṭrakūṭapramukhāṅkuṭumbinassarvān itthamājñāpayati Vidaditastu-


Second Plate, Second Side.

15. vōsmābhīḥ Vargiparuvāstavyāya Bhāradvāja gōtrāya Mādhava
16. Chaturvvēdi Śarmmaṇaḥ pautṛāya Vēdavedāṁgavide Śivaśarmmaṇaḥ
17. ya Vēdadvayādhyāyina tadgyajñōdēvasya Mādhavaśarmmaṇē
18. haṇa nimittē udakapūrvvam kṛtvā Aṣṭakaṇḍikā dravāvāpa prāmā
19. ṇa-Kṣētrā sarvakaraparihāreṇa dattam Purvataḥ Chittēruguta maṭṭa
20. bu Dakṣiṇataḥ Śēṇḍarūbāya kṣētram Paschimaṭaḥ Kōḍu Utara
21. taḥ Ppāṇḍagaḇa ētēśām chaturavadhi madhyavarti kṣētram grāmā pa

Second Plate, Second Side.



Third Plate, First Side.



(Scale reduced to half size)

Third Plate, First Side,

22. śchimataḥ || Asyōpari nakēnachid bādḥā karīṇiyā karōti | yassa pa
23. ṇcha mahāpātaka saṃyuktō bhavati Vyāsenāpyuktaḥ | Bahubhīr vasu
24. dhā dattā bahubhiḥchānupālītā yasya yasya yadā bhūmi sta
25. sya tasya tādāphalaḥ | Svadattaḥ paradattaḥvā yōharēta
26. Vasundhārāḥ ṣaṣṭivvarṣa sahasrāṇi viṣṭāyaḥ jāyatē kṛmih | Bra
27. hma svantya viṣam ghōrām naviṣa viṣa muchyatē viṣamēkākī naḥ
28. haṃti Brahmasvaḥ putra pautri kaḥ || Ājñāpti Bhaurāma Śrī.

TRANSLATION.

Ll. 1—12. Hail Prosperity! Śrī Vijayāditya—who is a Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśvara and **Bhāṭṭāraka**; who is the refuge of all the worlds; who is the devotee of the feet of (his) mother and father; who is a Parama-Brahmaṇya and Parama-Māhēśvara; who is adorned with good features and with combination of unalloyed good virtues; who is the Emperor of the entire vassal group of princes subdued by his valour; who is the dear son of Śrī Viṣṇuvardhana Mahārāja who is the refuge for all the worlds, who has his pure fame increased by granting *Suvarṇās* weighed in several scales and who has the entire circle of ruling princes subdued by the strength of his own shoulders; who is the dear grandson of Śrī Maṅgi Yuvarāja who adorned the family of the Chālukyās who have their bodies purified by the ablutions performed after celebrating horse sacrifices; who have had the provinces of the enemies subdued instantaneously at the sight of the excellent crest of Boar which was acquired through the favour of the Divine Nārāyaṇa; who meditate on the feet of Svāmi Mahāsēna; who are protected by the troop of the Seven Mothers; who obtained the kingdom by the excellent favour of **Kausiki**; who are the sons of Hārīti; who are of the lineage of **Mānava** which is praised throughout the whole world Ll. 13—21.—Orders, as follows, all the cultivators and chief headmen living in the village called Gommaḷūru in the District of Guḍraḥāra:—Let it be known! By me was given, with libation of water, eight *Khandās* of land together with crops, free from all taxes, on the occasion of lunār eclipse, to Mādhavasarma who is well versed in the recital of two Vēdas and who is the son of Śivaśarma who knows Vēdas and Vēdaṅgas and who is the grandson of Mādhava-chaturvēdi-śarma and who belongs to Bhāradvāja *gotra* and who is a resident of Vargiparu. (Boundaries thus:) To the East: Chittēruguta upland. To the South: Sēndarūbāya field; To the West: Kōḍu or, low land; To the North: Ppāṃḍarābu or, waste land. The land lying between the aforesaid four boundaries is to the West of the village.

Ll. 22—28. Regarding this—the land lying between the aforesaid four boundaries—nobody shall cause any injury; whoever causes any injury shall be treated as having committed the 5 Great Sins. Vyasa also has said thus: The earth has been granted by many; whoever at

any time possesses the earth, to him belongs, at that time, the reward of this grant now made, if he continues it. Whoever confiscates the land that has been given, whether by himself or by another, is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years. The wealth of a Brahmin is deadly poison; not so, the ordinary poison. Ordinary poison kills but one person but a Brahmin's wealth destroys the whole family, root and branch. Ājñāpti (Executor of the Grant), is Bhaurama.

TEXT OF SECOND SET OF PLATES.

First Plate, Second Side.

1-7 lines are same as those found in the first set, first plate, second side.

Second Plate, First Side.

8-12 lines are same as those found in the first set, second plate, first side.

13. mēṣvara Bhaṭṭārakah Prakunōravishaya Dinakādu nāma Grāma madhi

14. vasatō Raṣṭrakūṭa pramukhān kuṭumbinassarvān itthamājñāpayati vi

Second Plate, Second Side,

15. ditamastu Vōsmābhih Varjipaṇu vāstavyāya Bhāradvāja sagōtrāya

16. Mādhava chaturvēdi pautrāya Sivāya chaturvēdi putrāya Mādhava

17. va chaturvēda sravaṇādvēdi Sūryagrahaṇa nimittē grāma purva

18. taṁ asyōvadhīh Purvatah Metṭapaṇati pulam karusu Da

19. kṣiṇatah Vallēniyā kṣētraṁ Paśchimatah chīrāti chēla Uta

20. ratah Magaṇachēnu Dvādaśakhaṇḍivrihi vāpa pūrvēṇam kṣētraṁ udaka

21. purvaṁ sārvaakaraparihārēṇa dattaṁ ētēśāṁ chaturavadhī madhya
kṣētraṁ

Third Plate, First Side.

22-27 lines are same as those found in the first set, third plate, first side, excepting the mention of the name of Ājñāpti in the end.

TRANSLATION.

Lines 1-12 Same as before.

13-21—Orders as follows all the cultivators and chief headmen living in the village of *Dinakādu*, in *Prakunōra Vishaya*:—Let it be known! By me was granted, with libation of water, twelve *Khandis* of land together with crops free from all taxes, on the occasion of Solar eclipse, to Mādhava who knows the recital of the four Vēdas and who is the son of Chaturvēdi Sivāya and grand-son of Chaturvēdi Mādhava and who belongs to Bhāradvāja Gōtra and who is a resident of Varjipaṇu. The land granted lies to the east of the village. Its boundaries (are as follows): East—Elevated stone boundary; South—*Vallēni* field; West—Stone heap; North—Plain field.

22-27 Same as before, excepting the mention of the name of Ājñāpti in the end.

TWO NEW COPPER-PLATE GRANTS OF VIJAYADITYA I.


Second set.

SEAL.




(Actual size.)

First plate, Second side.



Second plate, First side.



Second plate, Second side.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Third plate, First side

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

(Scale reduced to half size.)

ANDHRA COINS.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

The *Aitarēya Brahmana*, a work composed long before 500 B.C., mentions the tribe of the Andhras as having been cursed by Visvāmitra to live on the fringe of the Aryan settlements, probably on the back of the Vindhya. Magasthenes who lived in the 4th quarter of 4th century B.C. as the Greek envoy at the Court of Chandragupta Maurya has mentioned them as second in power to the Mauryas. In the Asokan Edicts, they are actually grouped with Pitinikas, Pulindas and other Cis-Vindhyan tribes and described as obeying his laws. The Jatakas mention Andhrapura as situated on Telavāha river which forms the boundary between Madras Presidency and Central Provinces. The Purāṇas mention them as having uprooted, not only the Kaṇvas but also the Sungas who uprooted the Mauryas. The kings, who are described in the Purāṇas under the title of Andhras, are mentioned, in the inscriptions discovered in Nanaghat, Karle and Nasik caves in Western India, with the family name of Śātavāhana and the title of Śātakarṇi.

These Śātavāhanas, numbering 30 kings, ruled over the Andhras for a little over 4½ centuries and it would appear, from inscriptions and coins, that after Asoka's rule, when the Mauryan power began to decline, both the Kālingas, then under the Chedi dynasty to which Kharavela belonged and the Andhras, then under the Śātavāhana dynasty which was founded by Sṛimukha or Sṛisuka asserted their independence probably about 232 B.C. The inscription of Kharavela discovered in the Udayagiri hills on the east coast clearly proves that, about 180 B. C., the Sungas were ruling over Magadha, the Chedis over Kalinga and the Śātakarṇis over the Dekkan,

The early inscriptions and coins of the Śātavāhanas are found in the caves of Western India and it is therefore suggested that their rule started first on the North-West of the Dekkan and then extended along the Godavari and the Krishna Valleys to the East Coast.

From the discovery of the coins of the early kings in Malwa, Central India, Koṅkan and Mahārāṣṭra, it can be inferred that they established their political power at first over the Bhojas, Rāṣṭrikas, Mūṣikas and Mālavas of North-west Dekkan and then gradually spread it over the Andhras and the Karnātas.

The earliest coins are said to be punch-marked ingots, bearing dots or devices marked by a punch and belonging to 7th or 6th century B.C.

Punch coins bear letters of a legend which are each impressed by a punch. They appear long before the Die coinage is produced by the Andhras. As the art of coinage developed, the use of punch gave way to that of matrix or die. The plate is struck on a symbol placed below and then around this symbol, others are added leaving the other side plain. During the Chalukyan times, again, the punch coins such as the Varāhas and Padma-ṭankas appear. The punch marks are so many symbols of authority intended for securing their correctness and purity.

Later on, rectangular or circular flat pieces came to be cut from metal and they bear legends and devices on one side. Several devices of various sorts such as, human figures, arms, trees, birds, animals, Buddhist symbols, and solar signs, were impressed on *one side* of the coins. Thus, the earliest coins were handmade either by individual gold smiths or by merchant guilds and the punch-marks seem to be the result of circulation of coins from hand to hand.

Still later probably in the early centuries of Pre-Christian Era, the system of coinage was affected by Greek influences. The invasion of Alexander (326 Bc.), the Indo-greek and Indo-parthian settlements in the Panjab and Sind, the political and commercial contact between the Mauryan Emperors of India and the Greek Kings of the West, naturally had its effects on the systems of coinage then prevalent in the country.

In the first century A.D., Bhumaka, Nahapana, Ushavadatta who all belong to a dynasty called Kshaharatta ruled over Malwa and Mahārāṣṭra which were evidently wrested from the Andhras. During their period, they endowed several grants and from their inscriptions, we learn that certain Buddhist monks were endowed with several thousands of *Karshapanas* (35 ks. = one Suvarṇa). Nahapana struck both silver and copper coins and the former resemble the Greek coins in point of weight size and fabric. (Cf. Jogalthambi hoard of 13,250 coins found at Nasik). On the obverse side, we get the head of the king and an inscription in Greco-Roman characters. On the reverse side, we get arrow and a similar inscription containing name of the king. The use of this Numismatic evidence is that it gives us the true extent of his empire which comprises Malwa, Guzerat and Nasik Districts. Further, from the fact that the silver coinage of Nahapana was called *kuṣana*, we learn that he was the feudatary of Kushan kings, Khadphises I and II who ruled over N. W. India, in the middle of first century A. D. Lastly, from the shape of the head and the legends on the coins, we learn that the Greco-Roman influences exerted themselves on Indian coinage.

To the last stage belong the Die coins. These were die struck unlike the earliest punch-marked coins which were cast in moulds (See 3 Dotted coins). Molten lead or billon was poured into a cavity formed by joining two moulds and the joints can be seen in some of the coins. (See I, b.)

This method was evidently given up as it was clumsy and costly and the die struck coins (See Lion coins) came into use. The die of a lion or elephant or chaitya was impressed on the metal when hot on one side only and gradually the die was applied on both sides and thus the double-die coins came into use, bearing the royal figure and name on one side and different symbols with legends on the other. From the finish and neat appearance of these coins, we learn that coinage reached the final and perfect stage. Some of these found at Ujjain show on one side "the cross and balls" and hence they are called Ujjain symbols. Some of the coins of Andhra kings found at Amarāvati, the ancient capital of the Andhras on R. Kishna, contain these Ujjain or Malwa symbols. Most of the Andhra coins discovered are made of lead with Brahmi legends on both sides and having devices of lions, elephants, chaitya, etc., on the obverse and the Ujjain symbol (cross and balls) on the reverse.

Nature of the Coins.

The coins vary in size. They are mostly round but still a few square pieces which are really older in age are found. Again, most of the coins discovered bear legends on both sides and these are later in time than those bearing devices on one side only.

The coins of three dots or convexities rudely representing an elephant, are cast in moulds and the joints of the moulds can still be seen. These are older than the coins which bear maneless lions on one side and Buddhist symbols on the other. These really seem to belong to the later Andhra kings of 2nd century A. D. viz. Vajña śrī, Chanda śrī and Puṣumāvi.

From the different sizes of the coins and the metals used, their value can be guessed. The unit is the smallest lead coin exhibited. III-I It weighs nearly 18 grains. The weight of the coins exhibited varies from 18 to 148 grains.

Detailed Study of a few Coins.

The coins, cast in moulds, with 3 convexities rudely representing an elephant, contain on the obverse, a legend-ie, the name of the later Andhra king Śrī Vāsi and on the reverse, the Ujjain symbol. These weigh 40 to 60 grains. They are made up mostly of lead with a little copper coating. They are found in one group at Nagalapalli in Gudrahara-vishaya, the modern Gudivada which was probably the seat of Andhra Viceroyalty and a good religious and commercial centre in ancient times.

The Chaitya coin (See I, D) is one of pure lead. The Chaitya or Buddhist symbol is found to consist of 3 rows of inverted circles surmounted by moon. There is a tree to the right which is an emblem of worship for Jains and Buddhists. At the foot of it, there is a wavy line suggesting a serpent, or *Naga*.

On the reverse, we find the Buddhist cross and balls with dots inside and this is the Ujjain symbol. The legend is probably the name of

Gautami-putra Viliyayakura or Sri Yajña. The weight of the coin is only two grains.

The coins bearing on the obverse the lion facing to the left, with a legend and on the reverse the Ujjain symbol (See IV m, n, p.) are probably the lead coins of Rano Gotama putasa Siri Yajña Śātakanasa.

Value of the Study of Andhra Coins.

The only dynasty that used lead coinage is the Andhra dynasty. This fact is to be explained in this manner. In the Palnad Taluq, lead mines were worked out and the lead with a little mixture of copper (added probably to make the coin stiff and durable) was used. The lead coins which are of various sizes and weights were intended for use in the Eastern districts in particular. It is here that large hoards have been found out. In the Western Provinces, silver coins and copper coins were used.

Firstly, from the large quantities discovered and different metals used, we have to conclude that trade was brisk. Gold coins called Suvarṇas discovered at Amravati and Dharanikota testify to the wealth of the Empire.

Secondly, since the coins are found in the lands extending from Malwa in the North-West to Magadha in the North-East and Chittaldurg in the South-West to Negapatam in the South-East, we have to conclude that the Andhras ruled over all those parts.

Thirdly, since some of the coins of Yajña Śri and other Andhra kings bear *ships with masts*, may we not conclude that the Andhras were not only a great land power in the whole of India but also a great sea power! Andhra trade and colonisation extended to the Eastern Archipelago and Ceylon on the one hand and Egypt and the Mediterranean on the other.

Fourthly, the Buddhist devices on the coins clearly show that the Andhra Kings were great patrons of Buddhism. The Amarāvati Stūpa is one more conclusive proof which confirms the Numismatic evidence.

Fifthly, coin legends illustrate broadly the main changes through which the forms of *Brahmi lipi* passed during that period. The dated coins of W. Satraps, as pointed out by Professor Rapson, reveal the changes in *lipi* from time to time. It would appear that *Devanagari* was modified into *Brahmi* and *Brahmi* into *Vṛgilipi*. It would also appear that Prakrit was the official language which existed side by side with Sanskrit in the Deccan in the early centuries of Christian Era.

Sixthly, the evidence supplied by coins not only confirms the Purāṇic list of the Andhra kings but supplies chronological data.

With regard to the 44 coins collected by me of which 20 only are described here, all the coins are made of lead, and they are coated by time with oxidised matter. When washed with weak Nitric acid, the devices

became clear. *How are these devices impressed?* It is stated by Dr. Thomas and it appears to be so that the *large coins were cast*. Some would seem to have received a *super-struck impression*.

The smaller coins which are of copper and which possess the same devices and legends as the lead ones, would seem to have been *struck*. They are of 2 dies bearing more distinct devices. Probably, hot lead was poured into a hole of stone or wood and then impressed with a single die.

Clear cut models do not seem to have been used for, then, the devices on all coins would have been in the centre of the coins. But on several coins the devices are appearing some in full, some in part, some in the centre and some near the edge. Moreover, the rims of the coins are not circular but irregular, in shape. Also, all coins of the same denomination do not look uniform but some are thin and some are bulging out. Again, in most cases, the obverse and the reverse sides of the coins also do not appear uniform or complete. Obviously, the die used for both was bigger than the coins and hence the devices do not all completely appear on the coins.

The lion and horse coins have their reverse sides plain, and uninscribed. But in some cases, faint devices are still to be seen. On the obverse side, on most coins, the devices are bulging out but on some, they are sunken while the rims are bulging out, owing probably to their being struck hard.

Thus, there was recourse to 2 kinds of minting:—

1. To cast coins by pouring molten lead on a deviced surface and applying the impression.
2. To place cold metal on a flat die and strike it with a device.

All rim-bulging coins are of first sort. The reverse side shows no bulging rim. The Ujjain symbol is usually found on reverse. This symbol is always found in raised lines and is used in several designs and sizes. Usually, only a part of it is seen on the coins. That is because the die used for reverse is larger than the coin unlike the die used for obverse. One coin shows on the reverse side, parts of 2 symbols which are evidently joint. This is because the die is a large one with more than one series of 4 circles joined together by cross lines. Two coins show small symbols being impressed on large coins. In some cases, the symbol is of the same size as the coin.

Description of the Coins.

(Vide Plates)

PLATE A, I-a.

Lead coin discovered at Amarāvati; weight 18 grains.

Obverse—Figure of a ship (*Doni*) with mast is seen and at top of mast, inscription in *Brahmi lipi*. Coin probably belongs to *Sri Puḷumāvi* or *Yajña Sri*, whose ship coins are known to have been discovered along the coromandel coast.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol.

PLATE A, I-b.

• Potin. Found at Gudivada. Weight 48 grains.

Obverse—Elephant represented by 3 convexities with trunk raised facing to the right and carrying a rider. Probably belongs to *Śrī Yajña Śātakarni* as the types and fabrics are pointing out to his coins. No inscription.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol. The coin is peculiar as it shows the joint protruding at the top of the coin.

PLATE A, I-c.

• Found at Guḍivāda, Kistna District. Lead coin. Weight 42 grains.

Obverse—Elephant represented as on III, I, J, k, l; V-q, s; and I, b. Inscription at top. Probably belongs to *Śrī ya ṇa* or *Śrī vā si*.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol.

PLATE A, I-D.

A big coin of Gautamīputra *Śrī Yajña Śātakarni* (184 A.D.) Found at Amarāvati in Guntur District. Lead coin weighing 64 grains.

Obverse—Chaitya of six arches surmounted by crescent and Svastika. To the right of Chaitya, a tree within railing and underneath Chaitya, a waved line; along the fringe, probably an inscription of *Raño Gotamiputasa Siri-Yañña-Śātakanisa*.

Reverse—Ujjain symbol, (cross and four balls) having each orb represented by a pellet surrounded by one circle.

PLATE A, II-e.

Lead coin found at Amaravati, Guntur District.

Obverse—Lion standing facing right with head erect and tail turned upwards into a curve. Resembles in type, II-F, g, V r. No inscription. This coin, according to Elliot, belongs to Gautamīputra *Śrī Yajña Śātakarni*.

Reverse—Plain. These lion coins with no symbol on the reverse are considered to belong to the early Andhra kings.

PLATE A, II-F.

• Found at Amarāvati along with II e, g, and V r. Lead coin weighing 53 grains.

Obverse—Lion with mane, standing with head erect and tail turned upwards into a curve. At the top, inscription in *Brahmi Lipi*.—probably of *Siriyaṇa*.

Reverse—Plain.

PLATE A, II-g.

Coin of Gautamīputra Śrī Yajña Śātakarṇi. Found at Amārāvati. Lead coin weighing 148 grains. Biggest and heaviest in the list.

Obverse—Lion standing with tail turned upwards.

Reverse—Plain with a few dots.

PLATE II-H.

Lead coin, small in size. Same as IV m, n, p; V t. Weight 34 grains.

Obverse—Figure of lion is beautifully struck. The animal is standing and facing right with tail turned up on the back. No inscription is visible.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol is visible.

PLATE A, III-I.

Potin. Weight 57 grains. Found at Guḍivāḍa in Kistna District.

Obverse—Elephant with raised head and trunk. No inscription but it belongs to Siri Vāṣi like III-j which closes resembles it in type, weight, composition and find-spot.

Reverse—Parts of two Ujjain symbols not fully or clearly impressed.

PLATE A, III-j.

Found at Guḍivāḍa, Kistna District. Potin (lead and copper) weight 58 grains.

Obverse—Elephant with raised head and trunk containing at the top in four Brahmi characters *Śi ri vā śi*, the name of the king Śrī Vasisthīputra Puḷumavi, the 24th Andhra king who ruled about the middle of 2nd century A.D.

Reverse—Parts of two Ujjain symbols with 2 balls in the middle.

PLATE A, III-k.

Potin coin, found at Guḍivāḍa, Kistna District. Weight 33 grains.

Obverse—Elephant standing with a rider on the back. Coin resembles III-I, j l; I b, c. No inscription is found.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol with two balls clearly seen.

PLATE A, III-l.

Potin coin weighing 30 grains. Discovered at Guḍivāḍa, Kistna District along with 6 others.

Obverse—Elephant standing facing right. Inscription at the top of the coin belongs to the king Śrī Vāsisthīputra Puḷumavi.

Reverse—Part of the Ujjain symbol, showing two balls only.

PLATE A, IV-m.

Found at Amārāvati. Lead coin quoted with copper solution; weight 32 grains.

Obverse—Figure of standing lion facing left. Underside a line with dots. Inscription at top.

Reverse—Ujjain symbol.

PLATE A, IV-n.

Same as IV-m, in all respects, except that it weighs 4 grains more.

PLATE A, IV-o.

Coin of Gautamī-putra Śrī Yajña (Kudra!) Śātakarṇi. About 184 A.D.

Found at Amarāvati. Potin, made of lead, copper etc.

Weight 82 grains.

Obverse—Elephant standing facing right, under a tree. Inscription at top in *Brahmilipi*.

Reverse—Ujjain symbol, each orb of which is represented by a pellet with one surrounding circle.

PLATE A, IV-p.

Found at Amarāvati. Lead with copper coating. Weight 40 grains.

Obverse—Lion standing facing left with tail turned upwards on the back. Behind the animal, tree, and under it a line with dots.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol.

PLATES A, V-q.

Potin. Weight 40 grains. Found at Guḍivāḍa, along with I, b,c; III, I, j, k; V, s.

Obverse—Elephant standing with a mahout or driver sitting on neck, Brahmi Inscription at the top probably same as III, j. The coin like the other coins belongs to Śrī Vasisthīputra Puṣumavi, 24th Andhra king.

Reverse—Part of an Ujjain symbol, cross and balls of which are visible.

PLATE A, V-r.

Obverse—Lead coin of big lion standing and facing right, weighing 42 grains.

Reverse—Plain.

PLATE A, V-s.

Potin coin. Weight 28 grains. Found at Guḍivāḍa in Kistna District, along with 6 other coins, all of the same type and probably belonging to the same king, Sirī Vāsi.

Obverse—Elephant standing facing right carrying a driver on the back. No legend or inscription is visible.

Reverse—Part of Ujjain symbol two circles of which are clearly seen.

PLATE A, V-t.

Found at Amarāvati. Potin. (Mixture of lead and copper.) Weight 28 grains.

Obverse—Lion standing and facing left with tail turned up on the back. To the right tree. A line with dots under the animal. No inscription but it probably belongs to Śrī Yajña Śātakarṇi.

Reverse—2 pillars.



**MEMBERS WHO PAID SUBSCRIPTIONS DURING THE QUARTER
ENDING WITH 30-6-30.**

Messrs.	Rs.	As.	Messrs.	Rs.	As.
Ramayya Pantulu J.	3	0	Satyanarayana Raja Guru	3	2
Narasinga Row	3	3	Sambasiva Rao C.	3	2
Purniah Pantulu V.	4	0	Appa Rao D.	3	2
Venkataramayya N.	4	0	Purushotham Sonhi	3	2
Krishna Rao Nalam	4	0	Jogijaganatha Raju U. S.	3	2
Jagannadha Gopal Rao K.	4	0	Ramamurti K.	3	2
Miss Munro	3	0	Ramakrishna Sastri B.	3	2
Apparao Vissa	3	2	Ramachendra Rao R. S.	3	2
Ramachandra Rao B	3	2	Dubriel G. J.	3	2
Sitaramarao Kona	3	2	Sriram U.	3	3
Venkatarangayya M.	3	2	Gauripati Rao I.	3	2
Seshagiri Rao R.	3	2	Lakshminarayana Sastri Bh.	3	2
Raghava Iyengar S. V.	3	0	Herras Henry S. J.	3	2
Narayanarao C.	4	2	Satyanarayanamurti K.	3	2
Vikramadeva Varma Raja	3	2	Gopalakrishna Sarma R.	3	2
Subbarayudu M.	3	2	Seshagiri Rao B.	3	2
Venkatanarayana T.	3	2	Rajaratnam K.	3	2
Subba Rao L.	3	2	Venkatramayya D.	3	2
Jagannadha Swami G.	3	2	Subba Rao N. V.	3	2
Narayana B. L.	3	2	Satyanarayana V.	3	2
Narasimham D. L.	3	2	Gangooly T.	3	2
Sitaramiah Ch.	3	2	Narasimham Manda	3	2
Rama Rao M.	3	2	Bhandarkar D. R.	3	2
Prakasa Rao D. V. S.	3	2	Potdar D. W.	3	2
Satyanarayana B. V. N.	3	2	Brierley W. B.	3	2
Anantarama Iyer P. H.	3	2	Ramadas G.	3	2
Rangaswami Saraswati A.	3	2	Krishnaswami Iyer S.	4	2
Ramakrishnayya K.	3	2	Subrahmanya Iyer K. V.	3	2
Raghavachary K.	3	2	Avadhani V. V. S.	3	2
Rangachary K.	3	2	Khurshed Ali Syed	3	2
Hume Sastri B.	£	2	Hanumanta Rao S.	3	2
Raghava Iyengar S. V.	3	2	Suryaprakasa Rao Ch.	3	2
Jogiah V. V.	3	2	Venkata Rao D.	4	2
Krishna Rao Bhonsle R.	3	2	Hinde Narayan	3	2
Joganna U.	3	2	Somayazulu Ch. Y.	3	2
Venkateswarlu V.	3	2	Gopala reddy B.	3	2
Popley Rev. H. A.	3	2	Sarma L. P. P.	3	2
Vedananda Tirtha Swami	3	2	Jaganadha Rao V.	4	0
Surya Kumar Bhuyar	3	2	Bhujanga Rao T.	4	2
Veerabhadreswara Rao K.	3	2	Perraju K. (4 years)	12	0
Suryanarayana T.	3	2	Srihari Pantulu Guntur.	3	0

Messrs	Rs. As.	Messrs.	Rs. As.
Gopinatha Harichandra } Jaga Deb Bahadur }	3 2	Ramesam, Justice Sir V.	3 2
Lakshminarayana Hari- chandra Jaga Deb Bahadur }	3 2	Krishnaswami Iyer C. V.	4 2
Raghavachary N.	3 2	Ramalingam W. V. B	3 2
Narasimha Rao G.	3 2	Kameswara Sastri Bh.	4 0
Rao P. S.	3 2	Venkatarama Iyer A. V. '28-30	6 4
Veerabhadrayya Sri Hota	4 0	Krishnaswami Rao C.	3 2
Seshadri P.	3 2	Sambasiva Rao S. N.	3 2
Veeranna P.	3 2	Rajaguru Hemraj Pandit 29-31	5 0
Bhagavatam Gupta T.	3 2	Krishna Rao Mothey Sri	3 0
Subbayya P.	3 2	Narasimham Pantulu N. 4 yrs	12 2
Trivekrama Rao D.	3 2	Venkataramiah Choudry K.	3 0
Abdul Ali A. F. M.	3 2	Radhakrishnamurti Hari	3 0
Goedke Harry Rev.	3 2	Narasimha Rao Mothey Sri	3 0
Venkataratnam T.	3 0	Gangaraju Mothey Sri	3 0
Venkatarama Raju R.	3 2	Sitaramayya Somanchi	3 4
Makodya G. B.	3 2	Rama Rao A.	4 0
Somayazulu G. G.	4 0	Krishnamurty M.	2 0
Bhadrayya P.	4 0	Nagaraju Chitrapu 30-31	2 0
Reddi C. R.	3 2		
Srinivasachari C. S.	3 2		
		Total.	407 14

SUBSCRIBERS WHO PAID SUBSCRIPTIONS DURING THE QUARTER.

	Rs. As.
Superintendent of Archaeology Eastern Circle	6 0
Do Watson Museum, Rajkot 30-31	6 0
Secretary, Literary Association Cocanada	6 2
Principal Andhra Christian College Guntur	6 2
Do. P. R. College, Cocanada	6 2
Curator, Provincial Museum, Lucknow	6 2
Manager, Satyalingam Charities, Cocanada (4 years).	25 1
Government Arts College, Rajahmundry	6 0
Training College, Rajahmundry	6 0
Secretary, The Ellore Club, Ellore	6 0
Total.	79 9

DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING THE QUARTER.


	Rs. As.
Mr. B. V. Krishna Rao	2 0
Total	2 0

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V]

October 1930,

[Part 2



Amaravati Sculpture depicting a Stupa.

1930

RAJAHMUNDRY

Printed at the Razan Press,

Published by the Andhra Historical Research Society.

Annual Subscription { for Members 3 Rupees or 6 Shillings.
for Institutions Indian 6 Rs Foreign : 12 Sh.

Postage Annas 8 or, 2 Shillings Extra, Each Part Rs. 2.

CONTENTS.

8. History of the Velnāḍu Chiefs.	
M. RAMA RAO, B.A. (HONS) M.R.A.S.	65—72
9. Studies in Vijayanagar Polity.	
K. ISWAR DUTT, B.A., (Local Fund Audit Dept.)	73—83
10. Bāpatla Kaifiyat.	
R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.	84
11. Education in Ancient India.	
K. VENKATAPPAYYA, B.A., B.L., BED.	85—90
12. Amaravati, From A.D. 100 to 700.	
PROF. G. JOUVEAU DUBREUIL.	91—92
13. A Study of the Telugu Roots.	
DR. C. NARAYANA RAO, M.A. L.T., PH.D.	94—100
14. Sātālūru Copper Plate Grant of Guṇaga Vijayāditya III.	
BHAVARAJ V. KRISHNA RAO, B.A., B.L.	101—116
15. Stone Inscription near Siva temple at Santa Bommāli.	
SRI SRI SRI LAKSHMINARAYANA HARICHANDAN JAGADEB RAJA BAHADUR, TEKKALI.	117—118.
16. Gautamiputra Satakarni.	
R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.	119—122
17. Ballāḷa III. and Vijayanagara.	
DR. N. VENKATARAMANAYYA, M.A., PH.D.	124—136
Reviews.	137—138

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V.

October, 1930.

Part 2.

HISTORY OF THE VELNADU CHIEFS.

M. RAMA RAO, B.A. (HONS.), M.R.A.S.

These chiefs played a prominent part in the history of the Telugu country for about a century between A. D. 1080—1186. Their importance lies in the fact that they held the Telugu country from the southern banks of the Godavari down to Nellore from the time of the accession of Kulōttunga and handed over the sovereignty of the country to the Kākatiyas of Warangal. Thus they form a link between the Eastern Chālukyas and the Kākatiyas in the history of the Telugu country.


EARLY ANCESTRY:—Like many other dynasties, the Velnāḍu chiefs trace their ancestry from super-human beings. The following gods figure in it.¹

Vishṇu.
|
Brahma.
|
Chandra.
|
Budha.

¹ No. 736 of S. I. I. IV.

The Pithāpuram pillar inscription² supplies the names of the ancestors of the family. The first person Indrasēna is said to have been adopted by Yuddhiṣṭhira and ruled at Kirtipura in the Madhyadēśa. After an interval of unspecified duration came Kirtivarman I. after another came Mallavarman, his son Rana Durjaya I., his son Kirtivarman II., his son Rana Durjaya II. and his son Kirtivarman III. It is not possible to locate this Kirtipura Kirtivarman is distinctly a Western Chālukyan name while Ranadurjaya sounds more like a title. It may not be wrong if we suppose that the ancestors of this family might have migrated from the west into the Telugu Country either during or in the wake of the invasions of Pulikeśin II. and the establishment of the Vēngi branch of the Chālukyan House. The names of these early ancestors indicate it. Kirtivarman III's son was Malla I. who having helped Trilōchana Pallava obtained possession of the Six Thousand country.³ The first reliable historical person of this family seems to be Meliya or

2 The following is the geneology of the Velnadu chiefs. The geneology will be discussed at full length in a separate paper See *Ep. Ind.* IV, 35; *Ep. Ind.*, IV, 270



3

చతుర్థవంశ శ్రీమదురాసవ్యం

మం శ్రీమత్... .. శ్రీమల్లభూపాలని

యేనత్ర్యంబః పల్లవాద్రాణి శిరిస్సాహాయ్యకారాధితా

చాప్తాయం మహాంధు నామః ఘయ స్సామంతి చిహ్నైస్సహం

Malla II.⁴, who was a follower and vassal of the Eastern Chālukyan king Chālukya Bhīma II. From this time the Velnādu Chiefs rise to prominence under the succeeding Chālukyan rulers of Vēngi as generals and ministers. Eriya or Eriyavarman was a servant of Vishnuvardhana who is perhaps identical with Tājarāja (A.D. 970). Kuḍyavarman II. was a subordinate of Vimalāditya (A.D. 1011—1022) and ruled over the district of Gudrahāra as a vassal.⁵ Nannirāja, his grandson according to one source and brother according to another, was a general of the great Rājarāja, the patron of the Telugu poet Nannaya. The death of Rājarāja made remarkable changes in the history of both the Chālukyan and the Velnādu families.

RISE TO POWER. Soon after the death of Rājarāja, there was chaos in the Vēngi country. His brother Vijayāditya usurped the throne and drove away Rājendra the heir-apparent. At this juncture Vikramāditya VI, the Western Chālukyan monarch invaded Vēngi and subjugated the usurper. Mean while the dispossessed prince gathered forces and inflicted a crushing defeat on his uncle but pardoned him. The Chōla king Rājendradēva died at this time and the young prince set his eyes on the Chōla throne. Having reinstated his uncle as viceroy of Vēngi, Rājendra went to the south, and after strenuous fighting ascended the throne in A.D. 1070 under the title of Kutottunga I. Vijayāditya died in A.D. 1077 and from that date the Emperor was sending his sons as viceroys to Vēngi.⁶ This afforded a splendid opportunity for the rise of the Velnādu Chieftains. As generals and ministers of these viceroys, they were the *de facto* sovereigns in Vēngi. From the time of Vikrama Chōla even this system of sending viceroys was discontinued and the Velnādu Chiefs were free.

During the second viceroyalty of Virachōḍa we hear that the Velnādu chief Vedula II. was his minister. By A.D. 1118 Vikramachōḍa the last of the viceroys left for the South. Taking advantage of this, Vikramāditya VI. invaded Vēngi and temporarily reduced the Velnādu chiefs to subjection. However, by 1124 Vikramachōḍa seems to have re-conquered it. Vedula II. mentioned above so pleased his overlord by defeating a Pāndyan king that Vikramachōḍa rewarded him with the over-lordship of the territory between the Godavari and the Krishna.⁷

4 No 1182 of S. I. I. IV.

5 Ep. Ind. IV, p. 32.

6 Viceroys over Vengi under Kulottunga I.

Vijayāditya	1070—1077
Rajaraja	1077—1078
Virachoda	1078—1084
Rajaraja Choda Ganga	1084—1088
Virachoda	1088—1098
Vikramachoda	1098—1113

7 Ep. Ind. IV, p. 32

GONKA I., A.D. 1076—1117. Gonka is said to have rendered his overlord significant service in the field of war and got reaffirmed as ruler of the 6000 country.⁸ He was an ardent devotee of Śiva a good patron of learning.⁹ The *Keyarabāhucharitram* speaks highly of his valour and enlightenment as its does about the political skill of his minister Naṇḍūri Gōvindāmātya. Prōlināyaka was the governor of Dharaṇi-kōṭa under Gonka I.¹⁰

CHODA I., A.D. 1117—1132. Gonka I. was succeeded by his son Chōḍa I. who is variously known as Kulōttunga Rājendra Chōḍa or Chōḍa Rāja. During the last days, the emperor Kulōttunga is said to have adopted Chōḍa I. and treated him as his own son and confirmed on him the rulership of Vēngi. From the *Keyarabāhu charitram* we know that his minister was Kommana son of Gōvindāmātya, his father's minister. Another of his ministers was a certain Nārāyaṇa. This king is said to have had nine lakhs of money, ninety nine sturdy elephants and four thousand swift horses. It is important to note that the Western Chālukyan invasion of Vēngi and its subsequent reconquest by Vikrama-chōḷa took place in this reign.¹¹ The Velnāḍu chief came into conflict with the Telugu Chōḍas for the first time in the reign of Chōḍa I, for one of his subordinates—Kāpa of Tūmbaru—claims to have defeated a Siddhi Bēta.¹² A chieftain of that name appears in the Telugu Chōḍa geneology as Bēta I. We also notice for the first time that the Mandādi chiefs were vassals of the Velnāḍu rulers.

GONKA II., A.D. 1132—1163, Gonka II. succeeded his father Chōḍa I. He was the most independent and glorious member of the family. He

8 వీరశైవుని శిష్యునిగా పేరుగాంచిన చోడ.....రాజరాజాశ్వుని సన్యసి
సంగ్రామనాహాయ్య సుకుప్తితత్వాత్ శ్రీరాజరాజప్రభవానుసారః
యష్టత్సప్తసావని నుండలాధి పత్త్యం సమాసాద్య చిరంభువన్ క్తి||

S. I I., IV. No 1165.

9 మల్లన్నావేత్తేమకర్తానుకాంక్షః గొంఠోవిద్యత్ప్రసాదాశీమృగాంక్షః||

S. I I., IV. No. 1165.

10 List of Antiquities p. 64. No. 6.

11 This was in or about A. D 1120. Inscriptions from Draksharama prove that the Western Chalukyas were in the Vengi country between A. D. 1120—1124 Nos. 331, 207 & 258 of 1893. S. I. I vol. IV.

12 No. 441 of 1918. This identification of Siddhi Beta with Beta I and the theory of rivalry between the Telugu Cholas and the Velnadu line is supported by No. 143 of 897 which mentions a title of Choda I. as—“చోడకర్తృత్వపతి పాత్రా దనామాంకితః” which literally means ‘one whose name was engraved on the wall of the Chola King.’ The Chola referred to could not be the Chola Emperor because Choda I, was his vassal and adopted son. Hence this title should only indicate a defeat inflicted by Choda I, on the Telugu Chodas.

extended his territory widely, and had an excellent system of administration. In this reign the Konḍapaḍmaṭi chiefs became vassals of the Velnāḍu family.¹³ A Drākshārāma record enumerating Gonka's titles,¹⁴ suggests that perhaps he was also at war with the Telugu Chōḍas to the south of his dominions. Inscriptions and the *Keyarabāhucharitram* are agreed in telling us that Kommana son of Nanḍūri Govindāmātya was the minister and *Sandhivigrahin* of Gonka and one of the mainstays of his kingdom.¹⁵ Kommiseṭṭi a *Senādhipati* made many charities to the Bāpaṭla temple¹⁶ while another officer of the king built the Ballisvara temple at Kotyadona the capital of the Telugu Chōḍas.¹⁷ This shows the extent of Gonka's influence over the Telugu Chōḍa chieftains. Isāna preggāḍa, a brahmin minister is said to have built the Surēśvara temple at Kārempūdi.¹⁸ His other charities are brought to light by an inscription at Pedakodamaguṇḍla which tells us that he endowed the taxes of *Perunjunka* and *Vaddarāvula* on the local temple for the maintenance of students and ascetics.¹⁹ Two generals, *Dandanāyaka* Paṇḍa the maternal uncle of the king and *Dandanāyaka* Chōḍa the "maṇandi" or brother-in-law of the king, were very active in the reign of Gonka. Chōḍa's son was the general Gonka who is said to have defended the town of Kroccheruvu against the attacks of Karnāta cavalry numbering 30,000. Commenting upon this incident Epigraphists say,—"This was a period of decline for the Western Chālukyas of Kalyān." Taila III died in A.D. 1163 and his successor Sōmēśvara IV, was a weak ruler. The entire power was in the hands of the general Bijjala. The fight at Kroccheruvu must have been with the armies of Bijjala and probably in alliance with the Kākatiyas of Anumakoṇḍa who were just then shaking off the Western Chālukyan yoke."²² This opinion seems to be untenable in the light of the facts of contemporary history. Even during the life time of Taila III, many of his feudatories rebelled against his authority. According to Bhandarkar, "Bijjala conceived the idea of usurping the throne of his master and endeavoured to secure the sympathies and co-operation of some of the powerful semi-independent chiefs.—Vijayārka the *Mahāmāṇḍalesvara* of Kōlhāpur was one of those who assisted him and Prōlarāja of the Kākatiya dynasty of Warangal who is represented to have fought with Tailapa, probably did so to advance the same cause"²³, and thereby seek his own elevation. Dr. Fleet also confirms this alliance between the Kākatiyas and the Kalachuryas. This refutes the theory of the Velnāḍu chiefs allying with the Kākatiyas and that against the Kalachuryas. It is possible further to

13. No. 716 of 1921. 14. No. 675 of S. I. I. IV. 15. Ins. Madras Presy. Gt. 59.

16. No. 163 of 1899. 17. No. 175 of 1897 18. Ins. Mad. Presy. GT. 522.

19. Ibid. GT. 564.

20. No. 664 of 1921 S. I. I. IV No. 1069

21. No. 658 of 1920, 22. Ep. Rep. for 1921, Pt II.

23. Early History of the Dekkan. p. 222.

more that the Kākatiyas did not only never side the Velnāḍu line but on the contrary were enemies of those chiefs. The Anumakonda inscription of Prōla 24 shows that "Prōla extended his military operations into the modern Krishna District as well"

Uḍaya or Chōḍōdaya whom Prōla first defeated but afterwards reinstated is to be connected with Kulottungachōḍa Gonka of Velnāḍu "according to Dr. Hultzsch. Who then were the Karnāṭa forces with whom the general Gonka fought. A number inscriptions of the time of Gonka II mention that he fought with Western Chālukyan forces and one of them clearly states that the Kuntala forces led by the general Gōvinda and Lakshmana were defeated by Gonka on the banks of the Godavari.²⁵ From the Anumakonda inscription it is known that *Dandanāyaka* Gōvindarasa was governing Kondapalli in A.D. 1126. Probably the engagement Kroccheruvu preceded that in which Gonka II took part and drove away the Western Chālukyas.

A number of records mention Gonka as "Lord of 480 villages"²⁶. Probably this was the original principality of the Velnāḍu chiefs which later on they expanded. Gonka II. is said to have defeated the rule of Lāṭa Marāṭa, and Kuntala 27 and had many grandiloquent titles.²⁸ He was an ardent śaivite and placed golden pinnacles on the temple of Bhīmanātha of Drākshārāma.²⁹ He was the greatest of the Velnāḍu rulers and in his time the dominion of the Velnāḍu line reached its utmost. It is said that Vikramachōla's son conferred on him the chieftainship of all the country between Srī Sailam and the Mahēndra hill 29 while another source tells us that his realm reached Kālahasti. Some of his records are found even at Tripurāntakam.

24 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IX p.

25 గోదావరీపంఠం॥

శాశిపల్లవక్షుణ దండనాథసహితం గోవిందచంద్రాధిపం॥

జిత్యాహుటకభూటకోష్ఠ వివహైర్విరి క్రియంయఃపరిం॥

S. I. I., IV. No. 1182.

26 No. 945 & 655 of 1921.

27 హొర్విశ్వలూట సురాటకుంతల పరివృత్తిత్యయః సంతకుః॥

S. I. I., IV No. 1137

28 The following are some of the titles of Gonka II.

స్వస్తిపదుధిగత పంచమహాశబ్దమహా మండలేశ్వర వీరమాహేశ్వర చాళుక్య

రాజ్యధిపతి మూల సంద... చక్రవర్తివనవహన... చల

మర్రిగడ శ్రీశతోత్తర పట్టమా శాసనసాధ... ..

... .. శివసాదేశ్వర నామాది సమస్త పు

శక్తిసహితం శ్రీమన్మహా మండలేశ్వర వెల్లనాటి గొంకయ

Ins. of the Mad. Presy. Kt. 1028.

29 *Ep. Ind.* IV p. 32.

CHODA II. A. D. 1163-1181: son and successor of Gonka II, was the last of the great chieftains of the Velnāḍu family. In spite of numerous foreign invasions, Chōḍa managed to retain his ancestral dominion in tact and made further additions to it. In his time the Kōṇa country was conquered and annexed to his dominion.³¹ By defeating and killing Bhīma of the Kolānu family, he removed one source of danger for the continuance of his power. Besides Vīra Rājendra Chōḍa the Kōṇa chief,³² the Mandārī chiefs were also the subordinates of Chōḍa II.³³ The names of some of his ministers and officials like Dēvanapeggaḍa, Vāsenapeggaḍa, Sōmanapeggaḍa and Errapa Nāyaka, are to be known from inscriptions. Chōḍa had three queens called Gonkamāmba, Paṇḍāmba and Akkāmbika. Of these the last was a princess of the Konḍapaḍmaṭi family.

Still, disruptive tendencies made their appearance in the reign. The first attempt at independence on the part of the Kōḷānu chiefs was put down, and a matrimonial alliance removed possible dangers from the side of the Konḍapaḍmaṭi line. A third enemy were the Telugu Chōḍas. Under the leadership of Kannaradēva Chōḍa of the Konidēna line, they manifested a rebellion. A family of loyal and valiant generals rose to the occasion and saved the Velnāḍu line from destruction at this juncture. These were three generals in the service of Chōḍa II. called Jellaya, Nāraya and Sūraya. The former defeated Kannaradēva Chōḍa. More serious than any of the menaces mentioned above was the Kākatiya invasion of the Velnāḍu country. It has been mentioned already that Kākati Prōla's son and successor Rudra was a great warrior and made many fresh conquests. According to the Anumakonḍa inscription, the empire of Rudra touched Śrī Śailam in the South. It has also been mentioned before that Gonka II's dominions reached up to Śrīśailam and Tripurāntakam. The Anumakonḍa record of A.D. 1162 makes these two places the boundaries of the Kākatiya empire. Evidently the Tripurāntakam region must have been conquered by Rudra some time before A.D. 1162. This must have happened, therefore, immediately before the reign of Chōḍa II. (A.D. 1163-1181). Thus the loss of the Tripurāntakam region marked the first step in the break up of the Velnāḍu dominion.

There is great confusion in the chronology and the geneology of the Velnāḍu line after Chōḍa II. According to the *Kēyūrabāhucharithram* Prithviśvara was the son of Chōḍa. But the Piṭhāpūram Pillar inscription introduces a Gonka between Chōḍa and Prithviśvara. Thus the former denies the identity of Gonka III. The latest date of Chōḍa II.

30. శ్రీమన్విజయ చోడదేవతనయో యస్తౌపగ్రభవ్యస్త్రితః॥

పాదాదాను—మహేంద్ర శిఖరి శ్రీమైలయోర్మధ్యక॥

31. No. 1083 of S.I.I., IV, 32. No. 218 of 1897, 33. No. 1365 of S.I.I., IV.

is S. 1193 or A. D. 1186. If a chieftain of the name of Gonka III. existed at all, his rule must be placed between A. D. 1181 and 1186. The identity of Gonka III. is proved by the following inscriptions.

No. 181 of 1897 mentioning a Chōḍā Gonka mahārāja, the son of Aakkama Mahādēvī.³⁴ No. 247 of 1897 dated S. 1092 mentioning Kulōt-tunga Gonka.

No. 257 of 1897 mentioning that the mother of Keta II. of the Kōṭa family was a sister of Gonka III.

Thus Gonka III. seems to have been the son and successor of Chōḍā II. No. 247 of 1897, dated A.D. 1170 mentioning Gonka III. falls within the reign of Chōḍā II. This proves that Chōḍā II and his son Gonka were ruling conjointly between A.D. 1170 and 1181, and that from A.D. 1181 to 1186 Gonka ruled independently.

GONKA III. (A.D. 1181-1186) had a brief but eventful and disastrous reign. Compared with the regnal periods of his ancestors (41, 15, 31, 18) that of Gonka III seems to be remarkably brief. From the Pīṭhāpūraṁ Pillar inscription we learn that Gonka's wife of Jayāmbikā of the Koṇḍapaḍmaṭi family. No. 347 of 1916 mentions that another wife of his Kāmāmbikā or Kamādēvī.

DISSOLUTION OF THE VELNADU KINGDOM. The termination of Gonka's reign after a brief period of five years seems to have been due to same influences. His son and successor Prithviśvara ruled from Piṣṭāpura on the other side of the Gōdavari. Evidently both these events were connected. An investigation into the contemporary history throws much light on these two allied problems.

³⁴ This record and the Pithapuram Pillar inscription prove beyond doubt the existence and identity of Gonka III, while one reveals the names of his wife and son, the other mentions the name of his mother, and it is known that Akkama was the wife of Choda II. Thus these two records give.

Choda II--Akkama.

|
Gonka III.

|
Prithviśvara.

(To be continued.)

STUDIES IN VIJAYANAGAR POLITY.

K. ISVARA DUTT, B.A.
(Local Fund Audit Department.)

Continued from page 20 above.

His Proprietor-ship in Land.

"Some of the writers have confidently asserted that the property in the soil according to the Hindu view always vested in the 'Hindu sovereign.' The fact on the other hand is, that this is exactly the reverse of the Hindu theory on the subject. "Inscriptions proving to the hilt, the private property in the soil are extant," says Jayaswal in his monumental work on the Hindu Polity.¹⁰ That it is a fact, is proved by the innumerable epigraphs of the period. The provincial governors and their subordinates¹¹, and the private persons owning landed property, grant villages and lands for the benefit of the deities and brahmins.¹² The person who owns the landed property has the right of disposing of the land, at his will and pleasure except perhaps in the case of inam lands. The Tiruppak khuli Inscription of Dēvarāya II. registers the interesting fact that the lands concerned which were service Inams were neither to be sold or mortgaged by the parties concerned and also that whoever sold or mortgaged the land would suffer the punishment that the traitors to the King and community would suffer in addition to the fine,¹³ Two interesting forms of alienation exhibiting the practice which prevailed in the sale of private landed property are given in an appendix to this chapter.

Powers of Resumption and Reassessment

Two interesting epigraphs indicate the inherent powers of the monarch to resume the *Dēvādāya* and *Brahmādāya* lands originally granted. An epigraph of the time of Śrī Krishṇa Dēva Rāya registers that the *Dēvādāya* and *Brahmādāya* lands under a tank in the *Penugonda rājya* which had been rent-free (*Sarva-mānya*) from the time Chikka Oḍeyalu had been re-assessed on account of some disturbances in the interval.¹⁴ During the time of Sadāśiva Rāya, a certain Ajiya-Lingarāja renewed the

10 *Hindu Polity* p. 174

11 *Ep. Carn.* vol. III, M.L. 95, S.R. 139. *Ep. No. 87* of 1912, *Ep. No. 97* of 1913. *Ep. Ind.* vol. III page 21 *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV. *Kondavidu Inscr.* Nos. 165 of 1913.

12 Nos. 25 of 1915, 347 of 1912, 525 of 1906, 251 of 1906 etc.

13 *Ep. Rep.* of 1916 para 60.

14 *Ep. No. 180* of 1913.

grant of a village previously made by Śrī Krishnarāya. During the time of Achyuta Rāya, the village had apparently been resumed through the "mischief of mean-minded men"¹⁵

Prime Ministers and Deputy Ministers.

The King is always assisted in his counsels by a chief or a Prime Minister who is called in the epigraphs *mahāpradhāna*. The term *mahāpradhāna* appears in the inscriptions of Bukka I. for the first time. The *mahāpradhānas* of Bukka I. were "Nāganna Danāik"¹⁶ "Malleya. Danāik"¹⁷ Gōparasa¹⁸ and Anantarasar.¹⁹ The *mahāpradhāna* of Kampana was Sōmappa.²⁰ Muddappa was holding the same post under Harihara II.²¹ Nāgappa Dannāik was the *mahāpradhāna* of Dēvarāya I.²² Sālva Timma was the *Mahāpradhāna* of Vīra Narasimha Rāya and Śrī Krishnarāya²³ Bācharasu was the prime minister of Achutaraya.

Duties of the Ministers and relations with the King.

The principal duty of the Prime Minister is to advise the King both in peace and war, and invariably he is the generalissimo of the forces of the King. In all the above inscriptions, the additional title of 'Dannāik' or 'Dandānātha' is mentioned. Next to the monarch, the principal executive officer of the state, is the Prime Minister. We know from the Konḍaviḍu inscription that Sālva Timma led the forces against the Gajapati foe and won the day. It may be mentioned that the relations between the King and the Prime Minister were always cordial.²⁴ We find them making grants to the temples and the Brahmins for the benefit or the religious merit of one another.²⁵

As the inscriptions tell us, they are also the governors of provinces exercising their own authority over that part of the Empire, like any other provincial governor enjoying the privileges attached to the post. Paes gives an account of how the Prime Minister of the day was revered. "Salvatinica (Sālva Timma) who is the principal person that enters the building, supervises the whole, for he brought up the King and made him King and so the King looks on him like as father. Whenever the King calls to him, he addresses him as Lord Sālva Timma and all the Captains and nobles of the realm make Salaam to him."²⁶ Such was the privilege and power enjoyed by the Prime Minister.

15 *Ep. No.* 52 of 1904.

17 *Ep. Coll.* No. 132.

19 *Ep. Carn.* vol. XII p. 92.

21 *Ep. Carn.* vol. V B.L.

23 *Ep. No.* 342 of 1892 *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI p. 109.

24 *Ep. No.* 186 of 1897... This epigraph says that the bodies of Timmarasu and Krishnaraya are one.

25 *Madras Inscriptions* vol. II, Ongole 398.

26 *Forgotten Empire*, p. 268.

16 *Ep. Carn.* vol. IX D.V. 29.

18 *Ep. Carn.* vol. IV C.H. 113.

20 *Ep. Coll.* No. 523 of 1906.

22 *Ep. Carn.* vol. X M.B. 7.

Powers of Appointment.

Perhaps with the consent of the monarch, the prime minister possessed the power of appointing provincial governors. According to the Mangalagiri inscription,²⁷ we learn that Nādinḍa Gōpa, nephew and son-in-law of the Sāluva Timma, Prime Minister, was appointed as the governor of the *Koṇḍaviḍu rājyam* by the Prime Minister himself.

Deputy Ministers.

The prime ministers had the powers of appointing 'Upa-pradhānas' or the Deputy Ministers. Sāluva Timmarasu appears to have had an assistant (Upa-Pradhāna) in the person of Sōmarasa, son of Mēlamantri of Chandragiri.²⁸

Qualifications for a Prime Minister

The qualifications for a Prime Minister are laid down by Śrī Krishṇarāya, which have already been quoted.

The Office of the Prime Minister.

The office of the Prime Minister ceased to exist at any rate from the death of Achyutarāya. During his reign the gradual exit of the brahmins from the political arena, due to the enormous influence wielded by the brothers-in-law of the Emperor, led to the extinction of the office itself. The days of the brahmin rule were numbered and by the time Rāmarāya was at the helm of affairs and steering the ship of state, through stress and storm of political intrigues, against the bed-rock of Mohommadan confederation on which it finally wrecked, the influence of Brahmin was completely wiped out. Rāmarāya was also credited with the anti-brahmin feeling.²⁹

जामाता भून्महीपालः रामराय इतिस्मृतः ।

ब्रह्मणानां गुरुणां च नित्य मप्रियमातनोत् ॥

Mahī-sura-narapati-vijayam

Ministers.

In the first chapter, while discussing the appointment of viceroys to the various provinces in the Empire, the nature of the office and their position in the polity has been described. In an other chapter, we have narrated the qualities of their head, heart and hand. The minister under the Vijayanagar combined in himself the role of soldier, statesman and a scholar.³⁰

Some of the political precepts laid down by Śrī Krishṇa Dēvarāya for the guidance of a reigning monarch in the daily administration

²⁷ *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI 109.

²⁸ *Ep. No.* 3 of 1897

²⁹ *Mys. Archl. Rep.* 1907 para 58.

³⁰ *Sources of Vijayanagar History*, pages 48 49 51 52 62 etc.

of the kingdom, and also the important principles adumbrated by him in the selection of ministers, are quoted below from *Amuktamāyada*.

King.

V. 219. 'A king should first establish his power in his territory either being in terms of affected friendship with his enemies or relying on his land and water-defences (fortifications). After this without external fear, he should set about rooting out the internal enemies of his kingdom, just as a farmer first lays out the boundaries of his field and constructing fencing all round, softens the soil by digging up with the spade and removing the roots and stones in the ground.

V. 240. 'A king can find out three parts out of four of all the affairs of the state. He can find out the fourth part that has been concealed from him, through his favourites and friends. If with a mind full of the knowledge of polity, he is free from anger and is not very vindictive in his punishment of people who try to bring danger upon him, such a king can rule for a long time.

V. 248. 'Collecting money by oppressing the subjects, taking the counsel of worthless people, allowing one's territory to be annexed by others,—an able king should see that these things exist only with his enemies. When his enemy king is suspicious of his own feudatories and when they are suffering from his oppression, a king should encourage the latter and gratify them by presents of jewels and ornaments.

V. 252. 'Cruel punishments, want of discrimination with regard to flimsy charges, pressing an enemy without giving him an opportunity to come to terms, ruining (plundering) a foreigner who goes to him after seeing the wrongs in other states, doing things so as to be plain to the enemy's ministers, mixing much with the people knowing that they are not favourably disposed to him, looking with estrangement on men who can be relied upon, admitting too many into counsel as a result of their flattery, neglecting to punish a concillor, who reveals the secret counsels, not looking about carefully for remedies when any strange mishap happens, not caring for (looking towards) worthy people, associating with bad people getting addicted to the *vyasanās* (intense desires) and obstinacy,—all these should never be with a king.

V. 254. 'A king should increase the jealousies among the lords and warriors under him. Then their actions good or bad, can never be concealed. In trying to get over each other and become famous they will not entertain any idea of treachery to the sovereign.

V. 259. 'A king should freely converse in his court with the ambassadors from the kings of neighbouring states and speak to them about administration and war to understand their situation. He should so speak about administration and war that his followers may

understand his point. What his counsellors say through attachment, the king should not take as offence.

V. 261 'That king can lay his head on his breast and sleep peacefully who appoints as master of his fortresses such Brahmins as are attached to himself, are learned in many sciences and arts, are addicted to *dharma*, are heroic and have been in his service since before his time, and who makes arrangements for storing in those fortresses tigers' cheese (?) (Telugu *Pulijunnu*)³¹ and other articles to last for a generation, who gives to the subordinate chiefs (*Sāmantas*) lands and other things without lessening in the slightest degree the arrangement with them, who increases his treasury by multiplying his income and lessening expenditure and by seeing that the people are without trouble, who keeps watch on the territory of weakened enemies by his spies and capturing them suddenly like the crane which catches the fish, who sees that neither he nor his subjects suffer and who gives trouble only to his enemies

V. 270. 'A king should rule collecting round him people skilled in state-crafts, should investigate the mines yielding precious metals in his kingdom and extract the same, should levy taxes from his people moderately, should counteract the acts of enemies by crushing them with force, should be friendly, should protect one and all of his subjects, should put an end to the mixing up of the castes among them, should always try to increase the merit of the Brahmins, should strengthen his fortresses and lessen the growth of the undesirable things and should be ever mindful of the purification (?) of his cities and thus strengthen himself and increase his longevity just as a man strengthens his own body and increases his longevity by consulting good doctors, by learning the properties of the seven *dhātus* and taking medicines compounded with gold and other minerals, by taking food so as to suit his constitution by seeing that wind (*Vāta*) does not accumulate in his body, by regular anointments, by the nourishment of all parts by counteracting the change of the colour of the skin and the hair turning grey, by seeing that the teeth are firm, by seeing that the arms and similar parts grow and other parts like the stomach do not grow, by cleansing the system so as to increase its vitality.

V. 284. 'You should not think that ruling a kingdom is a sin and get embarrassed as to how to get rid of the sin. The scriptures do not ordain any impossible thing. Therefore you should rule the kingdom to the best of your ability.

³¹ *Pulijunnu* is a poetical expression, used commonly to denote very rare commodities. Here the idea is that even the rarest delicacies should be provided for the fortress. Ed.

Ministers.

V. 211. 'If a Brahmin who is a scholar, who is afraid of *adharma*, who is well-versed in *rājaniti* and who is between the ages of fifty and seventy, who is healthy in body, whose connection with the king has come down from previous generations and who is not conceited, accepts the ministership under a king and looks after his business, would it take more than a day for the *angas* (contituents of royalty) of such a king to increase?

Vv. 212 and 213. 'In the absence of such a minister if a king is not contended with ruling himself to the best of his genius according to *the Science of Polity* and with the help of a strong army and a full treasury, and has recourse to a minister who is devoid of virtues, the minister would prove a source of trouble like the pearl of the size of pumpkin and the king would ultimately find himself in the hands of that minister.

V. 227. 'In the council when one officer proposes a particular course another would object to it as unsuitable through mere spite of the former. The king should discover their individual motives and without denying the statement of either should close the council and then follow the course proposed by the first councillor, without spite.

V. 229. 'They make the king give (offices and presents) only to their favourites (people in their control) and make him dismiss from service others. They make it impossible for the king to act according to his own promise; thus dissuade others from joining the king's service by making him appear as a promise-breaker and not true to his own word.

V. 230. 'Just as when the keen appetite of a person loses its keenness on account of the predominance of phlegm and other causes an external medicine strengthens it, if an able new officer is appointed in the old one's place he would destroy the conceit (power) of the former.

V, 231. 'The method of bringing in a new minister to destroy the influence of the old is thus.

V. 232. 'When the treasury and the forces of cavalry and elephants are under his control in the stables, will not the machinations of bad ministers vanish before a king who is at the same time a scholar (intelligent man) and a hero.

V. 265. 'Kings would consult a councillor whose counsel suits them on one or two occasions. By such constant consultation by the king and by receiving presents from him he gets conceited and advises the king to undertake unnecessary things. In that case the king ought to have a watch over the actions of the councillor through his spies.' 32

32 The translation of these stanzas, as published in a small pamphlet entitled "Political precepts of Sri Krishnaraya" by my friend Mr. A. Rangaswami Saraswati Assistant Epigraphist, are adopted in this chapter.

APPENDIX.

TWO INTERESTING DOCUMENTS OF ALIENATION.

I give here two specimens of forms of alienation, from the epigraphs available. The epigraphs give details of the practice of sale of private landed property and the forms of document executed, at that time.

1. A Tamil Inscription at Conjeevaram.

It begins with the usual invocations and recites that it was written during the Government (probably provincial) of Bukkana Odeyar and Vira Kambana Odeyar after the *Sahabdam* a year of Śālivāhana 1222, in the year of the Hindu cycle *Plava* A. D. 1301, the sun being in the sign of Aqarius, in the first fortnight of the moon, on the 11th day, being Thursday under nakshatra of Pūnūr Pūsham.

In the land of victory, Chōḷamaṇḍalam, then follows a detail, showing the division, the township and the quarter of township, '*Modeliar Nacehyar*' otherwise called '*Yellanatalayal*', daughter of Tomoondi Achache the slave of Perumal among the *Dāsicul* (dancing women) announced 'of my own consent my own '*Canyatchi*' two *manas* situated'.....Here follows a detailed account of boundaries the property being a small patch in the town. "The two pieces of ground of mine, in the midst of these four boundaries" I consent to sell. Who will buy?" Thus she proclaimed, which being heard, then answered Ayapanaingar son of Coopanaingar of the tribe etc.... "If you sell at my price I will buy." Then the said woman and the purchaser Ayapanaingar both said, "We consent and agree for current money without blemish *panams* twenty seven"—These two grounds, with their groves tree, shrubs etc—, all these I have sold and having received the money without objection and have delivered my original bills of sale; there is no doubt with regard to the title of these grounds; if any doubt should occur, I will stand up and remove it. These grounds he may sell or grant in charity to any one and alienate at his pleasure and their price being fixed at auction at 27 *panams* which I have received without balance, they are hereby transferred to Ayyapanaingar, so on etc...with full consent by Nacheyar etc...in the presence of Aroolala Veejayaramam.

(Sd.) Aroolala Veejayaraman

The Second Inscription.

"In praise of the King Devaraya of Vijayanagara!"

When he was ruling the kingdom, in the year of the Kaliyoog 4517 of Śālivāhana 1349 after the year *Plava*; the 21st of *maasee*; the 5th of the increasing moon under the star Rogany, on that auspicious day was written this bill of sale.

In the land of victory Tondamandalam, (here follows subdivisions etc.) the village or township of Coommangalan situated etc... Moossoo Naig son of Audippa Naik of the caste etc... who resides in the village of Velloda, situated near the said Coommangalam he and his relations: Om! Agreed and proclaimed "The village of Velloda, half of which is my '*Canyatchi*,' will anybody buy my half village? These words being heard due answered in the *mandalam*, in the said division and in the said *naad*. Cota-Perria-Broomo Setty of the village of Wopanalakam of the Vysya caste, he and his kindred with their consent answered, 'we will buy. Then said parties (repeating their names) agreed and fixed the price in the presence of the Brahmins of 'Coommangalam at 125 new *Varāha* (pagodas) Then follows the measurement of land. We have sold our part and received in consideration or value fixed. This is the price; twice; thrice, the said '*Canyatchi*' of ours, you may enjoy while the Sun and Moon endure. There is no doubt of the title of the said '*Canyatchi*'.

In consequence of the agreement of Mooto Naig and his kindred with Cota Broomo Setty, we have thus confirmed it and granted this bill of sale of our *canyatchi* land.'

This is the hand writing of Mootonaig, of the village of Coommangalam. Subscribed by eight witnesses from the above recited and neighbouring villages.

Chapter IX.

THE BRAHMIN IN THE VIJAYANAGAR POLITY.

From the cradle to the grave the Empire was nurtured by the Brahmin. The Empire without the Brahmin was a watch without the mainspring, an engine without steam and a body without soul. A student of the Vijayanagar History will certainly understand from the valuable, both of epigraphical and literary evidence, we have the fortune to possess, that there was no branch of administration of the day and corner of the Empire in which the Brahmin did not play his part.

From epigraphical evidence, we know that the Brahmin sage and statesman of the day, Mādhava Vidyarnya was the founder of the City of Vidyānagara or Vijyanagara¹ Not only was he the founder but also the political preceptor of the two adventurous brothers Harihara and Bukka. His brother Śāyaṇa and nephew Lakshmidhara were the ministers of prince Sāngama and Dēvaraya I.² Gōpana mantri, a great brahmin commander, was one of the generals of army under Kamparāya who led a successful expedition into the South.³ Mādhava mantri was the ruler

1 *Nel. Ins. Kāpalur Grant* pp. 109-125. *Ep. Carn.* vol. XI C. L. 45 and 54.

2 *Ind. Ant.* Febr. 1916.

3 *A.S.R.* 1907-08 page 240.

of Vanavāsi under Harihararāya, Bukkarāya I. and Harihararāya II.⁴ He conquered Goa from the Muhammadans and annexed the Konkṇadēśa to the empire.⁵ Jakkana, a Telugu poet mentions two Brahmin Ministers by name, Jannaya mantri and Chāmana mantri serving under Dēvarāya I., Coming down to the period of Vīra Narasimharāya, and Śrī Krishṇarāya⁶ the whole empire was under the control of Sāluva Timma mantri the Prime Minister of both the kings. Not only did he hold the reins of the Empire in his hand but, also the important viceroalties of the day were distributed among his brother and nephews. Sāluva Timma was at first the viceroy at Konḍaviḍu and rose to be the Prime Minister.⁷ His two nephews Appa mantri and Gōpana mantri served as viceroys at Konḍaviḍu. Timma's brother Gōvindarāja was viceroy at Gutti⁸ and of Terkanambiyasīma.⁹ Afterwards, he filled an important office of the Governor of the city at the capital of the empire according to Paes,¹⁰ the Portuguese traveller. Rāyasam Konḍamarusayya, a great Brahmin general of the day was the viceroy at Udayagiri, Penugonḍa; he afterwards led the expedition against the Ruler of Kalinga and planted a Pillar of Victory at Sīthhādri and Śrī Kūrman. We know from the Konḍaviḍu inscriptions of Saluva Timma that that fortress was captured by him. The Poet-laureate Peddanna was entrusted with the administration of a revenue division by Krishṇarāya.¹¹

Instances of this type may be multiplied, but all go to relate the same story, that the Brahmin both by his head and hand, served the empire faithfully. He was the trustworthy minister, faithful friend, poet-laureate, bosom companion and lastly, the valiant soldier of the king.

It is interesting to note in this connection, what Krishṇadēvarāya says in his *Amuktamālāśada* about the Brahmin.¹² (1) "Appoint Brahmins only as the commanders of the forts in the kingdom." (2) "The Brahmin who is born in a low family who lives in the suburbs of Śābaras, who is not proficient in Vedas etc., who is a liar and a treacherous fellow, who is not afraid of any scandal, who is not a native of the kingdom and who does not discharge his duties, may be dispensed with."¹³ (3) "If a Brahmin who is proficient in *Śāstras*, who is afraid of doing injustice and well-versed in political science, whose age is below seventy and above fifty who is without any disease, whose ancestors are the faithful servants of the king, accepts the appointment of the Prime Minister at the request of the King, will not then, a half day be sufficient for the development of the *rājyānugas* (administration (?))"¹⁴

4 *Ep. Carn.* vol. VIII Shikarpur No. 281. and *Ind. Ant.* vol. II p. 2 and 6.

5 *Ep. Carn.* vol. VIII No. 46.

6 *Vikramarka Charitramu* by Jakkana

7 *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI p. 234.

8 No. 340 of *Ep. col.* 1892.

9 *Ep. Carn.* vol. IV p. 25.

10 *Forgotten Empire* p. 284.

11 *Rept. South Ind Ep.* 1912 para 55 and *Ep.* No. 623 of 1915.

12 *Canto v.* 207.

13 v. 209.

14 v. 211.

In this last verse, Krishnadeva evidently refers to his own Prime Minister, Sāluva Timma, whose head had grown grey in the service of the Empire and who was the greatest minister, the bravest general, and the deepest scholar of the day.

Paes says "because although the King has many Brahmins, they are officers of the towns and cities and belong to the Government of theirs."¹⁵

Nuniz states: They are honest men, very good as accountants lean men and well formed, but little fit for hard work. By these and by the duties they undertake the kingdom is carried on.

Chapter X.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

That the safety of person and property was entrusted to the viceroys under the Vijayanagar Kings, we have had the occasion to notice elsewhere. They were bound to make good the loss sustained by the people, on account of robbery.¹ This onerous responsibility was not mainly, shouldered by the viceroys, for they in their turn passed it on to their *Kāvalgars* (watchmen) "who had charge of groups of villages and controlled the *Talaigāris* (Tel. *Talararis*) who were appointed to each village." These *Talaigāris* still to continue to exist now under the name Village Headmen. They retain the old title, but do not do that duty, as it is now done by the Police.

"The *Talaigāris* were paid in kind and coin and granted also lands free of rent. The *Kāvalgars* were, highly paid officials and granted payment as follows: (1) a village rent free or at a low quit rent, (2) a certain portion of rent free land in every village under their jurisdiction, (3) an allowance in grain upon each plough or upon the quantity of seed sown, (4) an allowance in money paid by husbandmen on ploughs and by tradesmen on houses, shops, and booms, (5) a small duty on goods passing through the country and (6) a similar duty levied at fairs and weekly markets on shroffs (?) (paid in money) and other dealers (paid in kind.)

Nuniz gives a horrible picture of the Criminal Code of the day. The punishment inflicted on the ordinary criminal and the treacherous murderer, did not vary much. The punishment was retributive but not reformatory and if we trust the account of Nuniz, we may fairly imagine that there was no occasion for a prison cell, to lodge a criminal. Here is the account of Nuniz: "The punishments that they inflict in the Kingdom are these: For a thief, whatever theft he commits, howsoever little it be, they forthwith cut off a foot and a hand and if this theft be a great one, he is hanged with a hook under his chin. If a man outrages a respectable woman or a virgin, he has the same punishment and if he does

¹⁵ *Forgotten Empire* p. 245

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 390.

¹ *Bellary District Gazetteer* p. 187, and *Forgotten Empire* p. 380.

any other such violence, his punishment is of a little kind. Nobles who become traitors are sent to be impaled alive on a wooden stake thrust through the belly, and people of lower orders—for whatever crime they commit, he (the King) forthwith commands their heads to be cut off in the market place, and the same for murder unless the death was the result of a duel.

These are the common kinds of punishments but they have others more fanciful, for when the King desires, he commands a man to be thrown to the elephants and they tear him in pieces. The people are so subject to him, that if you told a man, on the part of the King, that he must stand still in a street holding a stone on his back all day till you released him, he would do it"²

The system of criminal investigation was very peculiar. Wizards were consulted and the thief was tracked. Nuniz states that "here are very powerful wizards in this country. Thus there are very few thieves in the Land"

The City of Vijayanagara and its Police.

The safety of person and property in the great city was entrusted to the Prefect of the City whose office lay just opposite to the Mint. He was the Commissioner of the City Police, with about 12,000 policemen under him. The duty of these policemen was to patrol the whole city, to acquaint themselves with all the events, and accidents, that take place, with its seven walls, and to recover the property that was lost or stolen. If they failed in their duty to do so; they were fined. Abdul Razack quotes a concrete instance: "Thus certain slaves that my companion had brought took to flight and when the circumstance was reported to the Prefect, he ordered the watchmen of that quarter where the poorest people dwelt to produce them or to pay the penalty, which last they did on ascertaining the amount."³

These policemen were paid 30 *panams* each per month, from the proceeds of 12,000 *panams* mainly derived from the dancing girls of the city.

The duty of the Commissioner (*Nagarādhyakṣa*) was to submit to the King, an account of the robberies committed in the Capital. It is said, that few robberies were committed in the capital. The Commissioner and his staff were always very vigilant to catch the thief and recover the the stolen property lest their property itself might be confiscated, "to make good the loss".

The principles laid down for guidance in punishments, are quoted below, from the *Āmuktamālyada* of Krishna Dēvarāya :—

V, 239.—"If a king were to propitiate his guards with presents and hand over to them for custody a thief whose guilt has been proved without immediate punishment and if when he escapes, the guards bring before the king another in his place and punish him, as in the story of the stout merchant on the spear,—will not the king's infamy increase?"

BAPATLA KAIFIYAT.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

This manuscript, kindly lent to me by Rāja Kāṇḍrēgula Jagannātha Rao Bahadur of Rajahmundry, states that *Bhāvana* or *Bhāvanārāyaṇa Svāmi*, by making known his presence through a tree, led to the founding of a town named *Bhāvapuri* or *Bhāvapattana* which became corrupted as Bāpaṭla in course of time. A certain Chōla Emperor named Vīra Pratāpa Chōla Mahādēva is said to have built the temple of Bhāvanārāyaṇa in S.S. 515 (A.D. 593) and made a gift of two villages Bhāvāpaṭla and Āmudālapalli, constituting them into *ayraḥara* for the god's worship and festival. A certain Krimikanṭha Chōla, and after him, Chōla Bhūpālādēva ruled over the country, till S. S. 775 (A.D. 853). Later on, *Vīra Pratatāpa Śūra*, Bhallaya-Chōla Mahārāja, a descendent of *Kāveritīra* Karikāla line ruled in S. S. 1032 (A.D. 1110). Then, Kulōttunga Chōlādēva ruled till S. S. 1037 (A. D. 1118). During his rule, Gaṇapati Mahārāja captured the throne in S. S. 1056 (A.D. 1134). His minister, Gōparāju Ramana assigned lands to Brahmins in S. S. 1062 (A. D. 1140). Then a ruler of the same Kākatiya line named Rudradēva Mahārāja ruled till S. S. 1240 (A. D. 1318) and then, the Redḍi Kings defeated the Kākatiyas and occupied these countries, and six of them ruled one after another till S. S. 1340 (A. D. 1418). Then, Lāṅgūla Gajapati ruled over the whole of the country extending from Cuttack to Udayagiri in Nellore District. His son Kapilēśvara Gajapati and then Puroṣōttama, Pratāparudra and finally Virabhadra Gajapati ruled over the whole country, until, in the latter's reign the *Narapati* king, Krishnaçēvarāya started from Vijayanagar on a victorious march against the eastern countries, defeated Virabhadra, and took from him Koṇḍaviḍu. After ruling for eighteen years, from S.S. 1437 to 1455 (A.D. 1515 to 1533), he was succeeded by Achyutarāya, Sadāśivarāya Rāmaraya, Tirumalarāya Śrī-Rangarāya and other Carnatic rulers, who ruled till S.S. 1500 (A.D. 1578) when the country fell under the yoke of the *Miccens* (Mohammedans). Malik Ibrahim and Abdulla ruled over the country and curtailed the gifts made to the god. The country was governed by *Amils* and *Deṣpāṇḍyas*. When, from A.D. 1751 to 1758 the administration of country was handed over by the Nizām-ul-Mulk to the French. They revoked the land grants made to the temple of Bhāvanārāyaṇa. The East India Company, who then succeeded to the government of the country in 1759 were just rulers and their Dewan, Rāja Kāṇḍrēgula Jōgi Jagannatha Rao Bahadur *Muzumdar* and *Sher-seristhadar*, Rajamahēndri *Śircar*, granted to their temple and several other temples servants and lands for conducting the worship and the festivals properly to the deity. In A. D. 1803 the East India Company put to auction these countries and then Rāja Vāsireddi Venkatādri Nāyaḍu purchased them and continued undisturbed the full enjoyment of the gifts of lands made to the temple and to the temple servants already.

EDUCATION IN ANCIENT INDIA.

K. VENKATAPPAYYA, B.A., B.L., B.ED.

(Continued from page 220 vol. IV. above)

II

Having considered the routine of the life of a Hindu student in ancient India, I shall proceed to give as briefly as possible the duties and responsibilities of the teacher and the pupil and the mode of correction resorted to by teachers in times of yore. The standing duties of a student are as follow. Sāṃkhyāyana II. 4, 5 refers to the teacher as saying to the student who approaches him for receiving education thus :

"A student art thou, put on fuel. Eat water. Do the service. Do not sleep in day time. Keep silence till the putting on of fuel". The student performs the *Sandhya*, seated in the forest with a piece of wood in his hand. He does the *Sandhya* constantly observing silence turning his face northwest, murmuring *Sāvitrī* and other verses. In the same way in the morning he does it till the disk of the Sun appears". When the Sun has risen, the study of the *Veda* goes on. In the evening and morning he establishes the fire in its proper place, wipes with his hand round it, sprinkles water, bends his right knee, puts on fuel invoking with the texts *Jātavēdasa* and *Agni*.

Asvalāyana 1. 22. gives almost the same duties. He adds that the student should beg first of a man who will not refuse, and in begging, he should use the words "Sir, give food", "Oh Lady, give food." The term 'Lady' was however used by a Brahman at the beginning of his request, by a Kshatriya in its middle, and by a Vysya at its end. *Parāśara* mentions the bearing of the staff, the worship of the fire, obedience to *Guru*, going round for alms, as his duties. He adds that the student should avoid honey and flesh, bathing for pleasure, sitting on high seats, going to women, speaking falsehood, and taking what is not given. (*Parāśara* II. 5. 11)

It might appear that some of the duties prescribed for the student are quite ridiculous and fantastical but it should be borne in mind that they refer to an age far removed from that which we live in. But the discipline in life which the duties engendered in the student and the humility which the student had to cultivate as, for example, by begging for his food are features of ancient education which cannot be brushed

aside lightly. I might state here that begging by a student was not confined to the students in ancient India. Some of the students of the monasteries in the middle ages in Europe also begged for their food.

Now what are the obligations of a teacher in ancient times? Had he merely rights without obligations, like the nobility of France before the revolution of 1789? No, the teacher in ancient India had his own duties to discharge in his relations with the pupil. The teacher had to love his pupil as his own son, and if he had more than one pupil under his charge—which was not uncommon, it was incumbent upon him to love them all as his own sons. The following passage from *Manusmṛiti* (Chap. 71: vv. 159—161) refers to the conduct of a teacher towards his pupil. "Created beings must be instructed in what concerns their welfare without giving them pain, and sweet and gentle speech must be used by the teacher who desires to abide by the Sacred Law. He, forsooth, whose speech and thoughts are pure, even, and perfectly guarded, gains the whole reward which is conferred by the Vēdānta. Let him not, even though in pain, speak words cutting to the quick. Let him not injure others in thought or deed, let him not utter speeches which make others afraid of him, since that will prevent him from gaining Heaven".

As regards punishments of pupils, Gautama says "As a rule pupil shall not be punished corporally. If no other course is possible, he may be corrected with a thin rope or cane. If the teacher strikes him with any other instrument, he shall be punished by the king". (*Gautama*, II, 42—46) Manu also awards similar punishments and considers the teacher who exceeds the bounds, as having committed the offence of theft. But Āpastamba is more severe. He prescribes frightening, fasting, bathing in cold water, and banishment from the teacher's presence as correctives to a recalcitrant student (*Āpastamba* V, 2.) It is needless to state that the above quotation makes us infer that teachers in ancient India were not generally in favour of harsh punishments for pupils except under extra-ordinary circumstances.

III

EDUCATION OF OTHER CASTES IN THE ANCIENT PERIOD.

If the Vedic Schools were confined mostly to the Brahmins, it should not be supposed that the education of the young men of the other two castes was neglected. It should be borne in mind that the Aryan society in the early epoch was flexible and the promotion of a member of either Kshatriya or the Vysya caste to the Brahman caste was quite possible as also the adoption by a Brahmin of the profession of the other castes (Rhys David's *Buddhist India*, 1913 Ed. pp. 56-57.) If the Kshatriyas and Vysyas did not avail themselves of the higher education

imparted in educational institutions run by Brahmins, it was due to their desire to equip themselves in the special study of arts and crafts which enabled them to thrive well in their respective professions. It is possible that a major portion of the members of these castes did not think it worth their while to waste long and precious periods of their lives in the acquisition of what appeared to them an unprofitable lumber. But instances are not wanting to show that some members of the Kshatriya caste at least could prosecute their Vedic study with as much avidity and proficiency as the Brahmins and assume a position of eminence in literary circles of the time. The name of Janaka, king of the Vidēhas, referred to in the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads* for his eminence in Vedic lore, is a case in point. Chitra Gangyayani, Javāli and Ajātaśatru were in a position to give instruction to Brahmins in the *Sāstras*.

Now what was the kind of education intended specially for the Kshatriyas? Gautama (XI.1) prescribes the three-fold sacred science and logic to the Kshatriyas. The royal princes were expected to receive instruction in archery as became their future calling. The cases, of Drōṇa who instructed the Pāṇḍava and Kuru princes in archery and of Viśva-mitra who taught the same art to the sons of Daśaradha, come to our minds at once. Military skill and right moral conduct were considered indispensable for a Kshatriya. Kauṭilya, in his *Arthasāstra* mentions four sciences which members of the royal family should receive, namely *Anvikshaki*, the three *Vedas*, *Vārta*, and *Danḍanīti*. The first comprised the study of the *Sāṅkhya*, *Yoga*, and *Lokāyata* philosophies. Agriculture, cattle-breeding, and trade made up *Vārta*. And the science of Government with a knowledge of criminal law was what was known as *Danḍanīti*. What Kauṭilya prescribes for the study of princes may well be supposed to apply to all the members of the Kshatriya community. But there is no unanimity of opinion among the ancient authorities in regard to the particular kind of education necessary for a Kshatriya. Be that as it may, it may be taken for certain that military training, the science of government, (*rājanīti*) and knowledge of literary works inculcating ideals of moral and religious life formed the curriculum of study of Kshatriyas generally.

As regards the period of training, the Kshatriya had to receive instruction for six years, that is, till he was 16, assuming that he was initiated in his 11th year in accordance with what was prescribed in the *Sūtras*. The Kshatriya should receive lessons in the forenoon and these comprised training in military arts, use of elephants, horses, and chariots in war, and the use of weapons. The afternoon was to be utilised for *Itihāsa* which included the *Purāṇas*, history and tales known as *Itivṛtta*, and *Akhyayika*. During the rest of the day and the night the young Kshatriya should not only receive new lessons but revise old ones. He should also hear over again what had not been clearly understood before.

As Rev. May remarks, "the education prescribed for Kshatriya held up a noble ideal, not in any way inferior to the education of knights in the middle ages." *Ancient Indian Education*, pp. 70—71.)

As regards the Vysyas who were the third caste, they employed themselves in agriculture and trade. They did not derive much benefit from the study of the Vedas for improving their prospects in their own profession. The Vysyas and the Kshatriyas knew pretty well even in early times that a good portion of life devoted entirely to the study of the Vedas did not add a title to their worldly possessions, and it might be supposed that they were only too glad if the Brahmin teachers let them alone without imposing upon them the unprofitable task, as it seemed to them, of studying the Vedas and acquiring knowledge. A Vysya was expected to know the respective value of the commodities he traded in and appraise their values correctly. For instance, he should be conversant with the quality, the fineness, etc., of pearls, metals, perfumes etc. which formed generally the commodities of trade. He was also expected to know the proper time for the sowing of the seeds, to distinguish between good, bad, and indifferent soils, the profitability or otherwise of carrying on trade with this or that foreign country, the mode of rearing cattle etc. The young Vysya should, besides these, know something of commercial geography, arithmetic, some languages, and some practical details of trade, all of which would be of much help to him in his special calling. When it became evident that educational instructions of the Brahmins did not serve their purposes adequately, establishment of special educational institutions to meet the demands of Vysyas became a necessity. The Brahmins in some cases satisfied the demand but when it was not done, the trading and agricultural communities in villages and towns joined together and established the necessary schools for their children. Writing became a necessity in these institutions and it was freely used by these communities. It should be noted in this connection that writing was first introduced into India by traders and merchants and that it was first made use of for satisfying the needs of commercial education before it was availed of for literary purposes.

Besides the Vysyas, there arose in course of time other communities pursuing various occupations. The carpenter, the blacksmith, etc. found a place in society and formed an indispensable factor in the social organism. The origin of these crafts may be traced even to the *Rig Samhita*, so, that it is not true to say that they came into existence in the later part of the ancient period. The four original castes multiplied gradually into innumerable sub-castes and sub-communities following different occupations. To the craftsmen, who thus came into existence, the three R's were not an absolute necessity. The crafts, like other professions of the three higher castes, became hereditary and the son of a

craftsman stepped into the calling of his father, on the latter becoming diseased, or otherwise incompetent, or when he died. Apprenticeship was not unknown. The son absorbed unconsciously the technique of his father's craft. The craftsmen in order to preserve the secrets of their respective crafts and in order that others might not enter into their profession began to form 'guilds' in course of time, like the Craft-Guilds in Medieval Europe. It appears that the only learning which these craftsmen needed was the memorisation of certain Sanskrit works which enunciated the principles underlying their respective occupations. The case of *Vastu-sāstra*, containing the traditional rules for the building of a house which in southern India was learnt by heart, illustrates this.

Thus, the education which the craftsmen received may well be termed "professional" in modern parlance. It might be that the members of these castes might be defective so far as sheer school-taught literary education was concerned but their training in their respective professions left nothing to be desired, judging from the standard of civilisation in which they were born. It is a mistaken notion in the minds of the critics of the ancient Hindu system of education that the Brahmins kept all other castes in total darkness lest they might one day compete with them for the supreme position in society. The truth seems to be that the members of these castes did not in the least trouble themselves about the unprofitable learning of the Brahmins which would impede rather than accelerate their respective occupations.

Now this leads me to consider for a moment the justification or otherwise of the charge usually levelled against the Brahmin community by certain ill-informed persons. The brunt of the attack against this caste amounts to this, namely, that they denied for the members of the Śūdra class, all chances of their receiving the benefits of education. (see C. E. Trevelyn' *Education of India* Ed. 1838 pp. 168-9 foot note.) The position of the *Antyajas* at present is also ignorantly attributed to the selfishness of the Brahmin.

The early European writers like Mill, Orme, Abbe Dubois, Buchanan, Ward and others aggravated this prejudice. The Brahmins are generally identified with the clergymen of medieval Europe under the mistaken analogy of the three orders of society, the king, the church and the nobles which existed there. The Brahmin is by them saddled with all the sins attributed to the priests in European countries. 'Craftiness' is an epithet invariably applied by them to the Brahmin. 'Immoral' is the term attributed by Hegel to the Brahmin in his 'Philosophy of History'. J. D. Mayne in his "Hindu Law and Usage" "which is considered to be the standard work on Hindu Law attributes the origin of the Law of Partition among the Hindus to the selfish desire on the part of the Brahmin whose

emoluments for officiating at religious ceremonies would be multiplied in proportion to the number of the divided members after the partition was effected. Sir Watter Scott in the only Novel where the scene is laid in India could not think of any other person than 'Brahmin Papiah' to serve as the villain of the piece.

But let us examine the charge. The statement that the Brahmins are a priestly class 'is at best a half truth and like all half-truths has been productive of an infinitely greater amount of mischief than many absolute falsehoods. All Brahmins are not priests nor all priests Brahmins. And if by 'priest' is understood a person who officiates at places of worship as is evidently the connotation of the term employed by the European writers, the number of such priests in the Brahmin community is microscopically small. The statement might have been true in the earliest epoch of the Vedic age when the Brahman discharged the priestly functions on the principle of division of labour, but those conditions changed in a later age. In the Buddhist age, the popularity of the sacrifice waned with the result that in the competition which ensued between members of the Brahmin community for sacrificial fees, some were compelled to follow all sorts of occupations. (Rhys Davids: *Buddhist India*. pp. 248-9) There was yet another cause for the change in the occupations of the Brahmin. It was the growing disinclination of the other castes to support the Brahmin who performed religious rites and sacrifices.

It is a pity that the early European writers either ignorant of the real constitution of the Brahmin community or too impatient to investigate into the truth of the statements made by them, began to apply the phrase 'priestly class' whenever they had any occasion to refer to the Brahmin community. And this phrase is continued to be applied "ad nauseum" both by the Europeans and by some of the Indians who take, for gospel truth, whatever is laid down by the former.

(To be continued)

AMARAVATI FROM A. D. 100 TO 700.

PROFESSOR G. JOUVEAU-DUBREUIL.

A. SECOND CENTURY; THE ĀNDHRAS. The only Āndhra inscription at Amarāvati belongs to the reign of Vāsiṭhiputa Sāmi-Siri-Pulumāvi, (Śatavāhana).

B. THIRD CENTURY; THE IKṢVĀKUS. It is certain that the Ikṣvākus came immediately after the Āndhras (Śatavāhanas): the alphabet of the Myākadoni Āndhra inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. XIV Page 153) resembles that of the Jaggayapēṭa inscription of the Ikṣvāku king Purisadata (*Ind. Ant.* vol. XI, page 256.)

Jaggayapēṭa is situated near the left bank of Krishna, and Nāgarjunakoṇḍa, where many Ikṣvāku inscriptions were recently discovered is on the right bank of the river; so, it is not possible to doubt now that the Ikṣvākus had a large kingdom and reigned at Amarāvati.

C. FOURTH CENTURY; THE PALLAVAS. The Prākṛt plates of the Pallava dynasty are certainly very ancient: the Mayidavōlu plates are written in the same alphabet as the plates of Jayavarman found at Koṇḍamuḍi, and Jayavarman's date cannot have been very distant from the Āndhra kings (*Ep. Ind.* vol. VI. N°. 31, page 315).

The Mayidavōlu document is an order, concerning the village of Viṇipara situated in the province of Āndhrapatha (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. VI. page, 84) sent to the governors of Dhaññakaḍa (Amarāvati). Viṇipara is perhaps Vipparla (2 miles east of Krōsūr and 12 miles from Dharāṇi kōṭa). It is a Pallava grant in Prākṛt dialect.

D. FIFTH CENTURY: THE KANDARA FAMILY.

The Maṭṭepād plates of Dāmōdaravarman are certainly very ancient: the alphabet is of the early type as in the case of the Pallava plates of Chārudēvi (*Ep. Ind.* vol. VIII, N°. 12) and of Vijaya-Dēvavarman (*Ep. Ind.* vol. IX, N°. 7) the old Śālaṅkāyana king.

These plates (Maṭṭepād, Chārudēvi and Vijaya-Devavarman) are in a peculiar language: Prākṛt and Sanskrit mixed. Dāmōdaravarman of the Maṭṭepād plates (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. XVII, N°. 18, page 327) resided at a city called Kandarapura and was a worshipper of *Samyak-Sambuddha*; he belongs to the *Gotra* of Ānanda. The Chēzarla inscription (*Ep. Report*

for 1900 pp. 5 and 35) mentions the daughter of king Kandara of the Ananda gōtra.

The king Attivarman (a Prakṛt form of Hastivarman) of the Kandara family and Ānanda Gōtra refers, in the Gōraṇṭla grant (Gōraṇṭla is 20 miles from Amarāvati) to Tādikoṇḍa (12 miles south of Amarāvati), to Āntukūrṛa or Andukūru (a village 2 miles east of Krōsur and 12 miles from Amarāvati) (See *Ep. Ind.* vol. XVII, page 327 and *Ind. Ant.* vol. IX, page, 102) and to a field south of the Kṛṣṇabennā.

E. SIXTH CENTURY: THE VIṢṆUKUṆḌINS.

During the second half of the fifth century, the Viṣṇukuṇḍins, a dynasty related with the vākātakas, replaced the Śālaṅkāyanas at Vēngi and reigned at Dendulūru. They were very powerful, circ. 500 A.D.; they crossed the Kṛṣṇa river and replaced the Ānanda family at Amarāvati.

Vēlupūru (Vēlpūru) 2 miles north of Krōsūr and 12 miles west from Amarāvati has a very important stone inscription (*Report on Epig.* for 1925-26, page 3.); the inscription (N^o. 581 of 1925) mentions king Mādhavavarman of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin dynasty.

F. SEVENTH CENTURY: THE CHĀLUKYAS.

Pulikēśin II. put an end to the Viṣṇukuṇḍin dynasty and the Eastern Chālukyas reigned during the seventh century.

CONCLUSION: We can resume in a tabular form the chronological evolution of the documents:

Date.	Dynasty.	Language.	Religion.	Copper-Plates.
II Century	Āndhra	Prākṛt	Buddhist	No copper-plates.
III „	Ikshvāku	Prākṛt	Buddhist	No copper-plates.
IV „	Pallava	Prākṛt	Buddhist & Hindu	Rare copper-plates.
V „	Kandara	Prākṛt & Sanskr̥t mixed.	Buddhist & Hindu	Rare copper-plates.
VI „	Viṣṇukuṇḍin	Sanskṛt	Hindu	Several copper-plates.
VII „	E. Chālukya	Sanskṛt	Hindu	Numerous copper plates.

A STUDY OF TELUGU ROOTS.*

Dr. C. NARAYANA RAO M.A., L.T., Ph. D.

1. In my lectures which I delivered under the auspices of the Madras University in 1929, I hazarded the suggestion that the Dravidian languages were only a variety of the Prākṛits and adduced many points of resemblance in vocabulary and structure between them and the Prākṛits. I contended on the basis of many facts which I put forth in those lectures that neither the Scythian theory of Caldwell nor the Isolation theory now in the field, much less any extra-Aryan affinity of the Dravidian languages that is sometimes suggested can be maintained with any degree of probability, and that scholars had so far directed their vision far beyond the borders of India while a close affinity is clearly perceptible nearer home. These lectures, I printed under the name of "An Introduction to Dravidian Philology"† and the book received varying degrees of appreciation. The one outstanding criticism of the book is that, it is more in the nature of a speculation and required much greater evidence to carry conviction. Of course, when I published the book, I was deeply conscious of the insufficiency of the data supplied therein, but the limitations under which those lectures were delivered would not allow me to give more details than what were presented in them. I take this opportunity to begin to supply the details which workers in Dravidian Philology would like to know.

2. I begin with a study of the Telugu Roots. I take up Telugu not only because it is my mother-tongue, but also, because it is spoken by the greatest number among the Dravidian peoples and affinities with the Prākṛit can be established with the least difficulty in that language. If Prākṛit affinities could be satisfactorily established with the Telugu roots, it will become easy to establish the Prākṛitic nature of the other Dravidian languages also by simply finding out cognate roots in them.

3. Telugu roots, like Prākṛit roots, and like the roots in any other modern Aryan languages, are generally classified under three heads, *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *deśya*. There is not much difficulty with regard to the first two classes for they could be easily derived either from Sanskrit or Prākṛit. The '*tatsama*' are either '*Sanskṛita samās*' or

* A paper presented to the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference 1930.

† An Introduction to Dravidian Philology, Sadhana Book Depot, Anantapur

'*Prākṛita samās*' and are formed by the addition of suffixes which have come to be attached to them in the different languages. The '*tadbhavas*' are either '*Saṃskṛita-samās*' or '*Prākṛita-samās*' and are formed by the addition of suffixes which have come to be attached to them in the different languages. The '*tadbhavas*' are modified forms of *Saṃskṛita*, or *Prākṛita* originals and have, along with the '*tatsamā*' and '*dēśya*' words, almost the same suffixes. Following BEAMES, I would regard the '*Prākṛitasamās*', *Saṃskṛitabhavas* and *Prākṛitabhavas*' as late '*tadbhavas*'. '*Tatsamās*' or '*tadbhavas*', however, are of no use to the solution of the Dravidian problem, for they prove nothing beyond the fact of borrowing. It is only their suffixes that will interest us and as these are found in the '*Dēśyas*' also, it will be sufficient to discuss them under that head.

4. '*Dēśyas*' are regarded as a class by themselves, and the name is given to such words and forms which could not be traced to any *Saṃskṛita* or *Prākṛita* originals. Some have considered them to be extra-Aryan. This has been the opinion about the *Prākṛit dēśyas* and those in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars also. But with the advance of philological research, more and more, these are being brought within the sphere of the Aryan. The opinion that these are extra-Aryan or even Dravidian is gradually giving place to the view that they are early '*tadbhavas*' and that they can be proved to be so by the application of the phonological laws of change. I beg to suggest that, if this is so with regard to the acknowledged Aryan languages, the same may, on investigation, hold good in the case of Telugu and the rest of the Dravidian languages also, if by the application of the same phonological laws, the so-called '*dēśyas*' in the Dravidian languages could be proved to be only early '*tadbhavas*' disguised beyond recognition by the extreme changes that have occurred among them. At least, it will not be just to set aside the unanimous opinion of the Native Grammarians without directing our investigation into the correctness or otherwise of the position taken up by them.

5. For the Telugu roots, I rely in this paper on the Telugu Dictionary '*Śabdaratnākaramu*' by Sītārāmachāryulu. This is the biggest Telugu dictionary and is generally acknowledged as an authority on the Telugu language. I classify the Telugu roots found in this dictionary according to their endings. Sītārāmachāryulu is a Saṃskṛitist and has not allowed any word to be derived from a non-Saṃskṛitic original where even the semblance of a Saṃskṛit affinity could be suggested. So, when he says a root is '*dēśya*', it may be taken as beyond dispute that he could not trace it to a Saṃskṛit or Prākṛit original. I take, therefore, only such Telugu roots as he has indicated to be '*dēśyas*' and proceed to investigate them.

6. Telugu roots may be classified for the sake of convenience according to their endings, as under. The number, given by the side of each root, indicates the number of Telugu roots with that ending found in the above dictionary,

- :ku ఈ 20, ñku ఁ 10, ku క 62, kku క్క 34;
 :gu గ 5, ñgu ఁ 15, gu గ 58, ggu గ్గ 15;
 :tsu చు 35, ntsu ఁ 48, tsu చు 211, ttsu చ్చు 22;
 :dzu జ 7, ñdzu ఁ 5, dzu జ 0, dzdzu జ్జ 2,
 :tu ట 9, ñtu ఁ 5, tu ట 11, ttu ట్ట 21;
 :du డ 9, ñdu ఁ 11, du డ 34, ddu డ్డ 21; nu న 1;
 :tu త 1, ntu ఁ 0, tu త 1, ttu త్త 9,
 :bu డ 8, ndu ఁ 12, du డ 3, ddu డ్డ 4, nu న 17, nnu న్న 4;
 :pu ప 8, ñpu ఁ 11, pu ప 65, ppu ప్ప 12;
 :bu బ 0, ñbu ఁ 1, bu బ 0, bbu బ్బ 9; mu మ 32, mmu మ్మ 17;
 :yu య 113, ñyu ఁ 11, ru ర 73, ru ర 22, rru ర్రి 3;
 :lu ల 119, ñlu ఁ 118, lu ల 8, llu ల్ల 8, vu వ 50, vvu వ్వు 11,
 :su స 1.

The same arranged according to their descending order of frequency is:—

ntsu చు 188, tsu చు 211, yu య 133, lu ల 119, llu ల్ల 118, :gu గ 75, ru ర 73, pu ప 65, ku క 62, vu వ 50, :tsu చు 35, kku క్క 34, mu మ 32, ru ర 28, ttsu చ్చు 22, ttu ట్ట 21, :ku ఈ 20, nu న, mmu మ్మ 17, ñgu ఁ, ggu గ్గ 15, ndu ఁ, ppu ప్ప 12, ñdu ఁ, ñpu ఁ, yu య్వి vvu వ్వు 11, ñku ఁ 10, :tu ట :du డ, ttu త్త, bbu బ్బ 9, :du డ, :pu ప llu ల్ల 8, :dzu జ 7, ñdzu ఁ 5, ddu డ్డ nnu న్న 4, du డ, rru ర్రి 3, dzdzu జ్జ 2, nu న, :tu త, tu త, ñbu ఁ su స 1, dzu జ, ntu ఁ, :bu బ 0.

7. The total number of 'dēśya' roots recorded in the dictionary is thus 1698. But all these cannot be called basic roots as they include a larger number of dialectic variations and forms disguised by the operation of phonological change. Thus—

a. Partial denasalization and lengthening of previous vowel
 nku—īku.

b. Softening of medial surds: *atuku*—*aduku*, etc.

Vowels:—

INITIAL :

a. a-u: *adaru-udaru* etc.,

i-e: *peruku-piku* etc.,

i-u: *tuḷaḷiñtsu-tuḷakiñtsu* etc.,

e-ē: *esaru-esaru* etc.,

*MEDIAL:

b. 1. a-u: *adaru-aduru* etc.,

2. 'i-iy: *bigiñtsu-bigiyiñtsu* etc.,

c. Lengthening of initial vowel: *oḍutsu oḍiñtsu* etc.,

d. Lengthening of medial vowel: *āratiñ su-arātiñtsu* etc.,

e. Loss of medial vowel: *peruku: perku: igurutsu-igurtsu:*

f. Interposition of vowel between the elements of a conjunct consonant: *l rēḍiñtsu-kēraḍiñtsu* etc.,

Consonants:-

INITIAL:

a. Insertion: *añtsu-pañtsu, attu-hattu* etc.,

b. ts-dz-g: *tsiṛu-dziṛu-giṛu* etc.,

dz-d: *dzaḍiyu-daḍiyu* etc.,

ḍ-ṛ: *paḍu-paratsu* etc.,

t-d: *tanuku-danuku* etc.,

d-ḍ: *dakku-ḍakku* etc.,

p-m: *peruku-meruku* etc.,

p-v: *veli aliñtsu-veluvañtsu* etc.,

p-h: *pettsu-hettsu* etc.,

kk-g: *mikkilu-magulu* etc.,

MEDIAL:

a. Shortening of medial consonant: *ets sariñtsu- ētsariñtsu* etc.,

b. Insertion of a medial consonant: *ummaliñtsu-ummaliñtsu* etc.,

c. Softening of medial surds: *atuku-aduku* etc.,

d. Changes in medial consonants:-

k-m: *poṭakariñtsu-potamariñtsu* etc.,

g-v: *igiriñtsu iviñtsu* etc.,

ḍ-ṇ: *puḍuku puṇuku* etc.,

ḍ-r: *mummaḍiñtsu mummariñtsu* etc.,

t-b: *galatariñtsu galibariñtsu* etc.,

d-n: *vedaku-venaku* etc.,

n-r: *tsinugu-tsirugu* etc.,

n-l: *tsinuku-tsiluku* etc.,

b-m: *gubuku-gumiuku* etc.,

bb-m: *ibbaḍiñtsu immaḍiñtsu* etc.,

r-ḷ: *uppariñtsu-uppaḷiñtsu* etc.,

r-r: *eragu-eragu* etc.,

r-l: *giṛuku-giluku* etc.,

ḷ-ḍ-ḷ: *velugu-beḍakū-beḷukū* etc.,

s-t: *pōsariñtsu-pōtariñtsu* etc.,

ḷ-r: *rangariñtsu-rangariñtsu* etc.,

Final Consonants:—**(a) CHANGES:—**

ku-gu : tolaku-toḷagu etc.,

kk-gg : mrakku-mraggu etc.,

g-y : tselagu-tselayu etc.,

gu-vu : esagu-esavu etc.,

tsanu-tsu : kaḍatsanu-kaḍatsu etc.,

tsu-ñtsu : velārutsu-velāriñtsu etc.,

ñtsu-llu : tārasīñtsu-tārasillu etc.,

pp-vv : oppu-ovvu etc.,

r-l : viduru-vidulu etc.,

vu-gu : avu-agu etc.,

vv-mm : ovvu-ommu e'c.,

s-d : sarasu-saradu etc.,

Loss of medial consonant and compensatory lengthening ;

tanuku-tāku.

Nasalization : pikku-pingu etc.,

Partial denasalization and lengthening of previous vowel :

Metathesis : kōgu-gōku etc.,

Assimilation : inmaḍiñtsu-immaḍiñtsu ; maḷalu-maḷḷu ; veḍaḷu-veḷḷu etc.

Each of the above examples illustrates the operation of a phonetic law by means of which variant forms of a particular root are obtained. Other phonetic laws also have their play, so that, there is an inordinate swelling of the number of the basic forms of Telugu verbs. Strictly speaking, therefore, there cannot exist more than, say, 300 to 400 '*deśya*' roots which have to be accounted for on the supposition that they are derived from the Prākṛit languages.

3. I shall proceed to examine the origin of the endings of the above verbal bases. The examples given under each head will be only such bases as are definitely regarded as '*deśyas*' by the Native Grammarians and lexicographers.

1. KU

The 'ku' is from Sanskrit. *kṛi and the fifth class suffix 'nu', i. e., 'kṛiṇu', which may become either 'kanu' or 'konu' in Prakrit. That it is so, can be known from the fact that forms with the so-called auxiliary verbs 'kanu' and 'konu' have forms in 'ku' also as variants, e.g., ūku, ūkonu ; tāku ; tākonu etc.,. The nasalization of the ending is due to its association with (a) a nasal, (b) a nasal *plus* consonant, or (c) a consonant like *t, th, d dh, l, r*, etc., which have a tendency to be turned into nasals.

Examples.

a. Nasal and kṛi : iku (yam).

b. Nasal* and consonant *plus* kṛi : gīku (kṛint).; pīku (bhind).

2. Consonant having a tendency to nasalization *plus* *kṛi*:
kelaku (kṛiś), *toraku, tolaku, tonaku, (strī); toḍaku, tolaku, tonāku,
trut; sākū (usādh);

Root and fifth class suffix *plus* 'kṛi': dūku (dhūnu),

Past pass. participle *plus* 'kṛi': beḍaku, beḷaku, vaḍaku, vaṇaku (bhīta).

Prefix *plus* * *kṛi*: ūku (ud).

Adverb *plus* 'kṛi': tsīku sīt; ḍōkū (thūt).

2. NKU.

a. Nasal *plus* *kṛi*: iñku (yam).

b. Nasal and consonant *plus* 'kṛi': nañku (nyañch)

c. Prefix *plus* 'kṛi': uñku (ud).

d. Consonant with nasalizing tendency *plus* 'kṛi': ḍuñku, ḍoñku
(adhas).

e. Skt. root and prassive suffix 'ye' and *kṛi*: ; ḍiñku (ḍīya),
boñku (brūya).

f. Gutturalization of the 'ñch' ending of a Skt. root: koñku,
(kuñch or kruñch).

3. KU.

a. Root and class suffix *plus* 'kṛi': Examples are :—

iṛuku (riś); uḍuku (ush); uṛuku (ruh); tsituku, tsiduku, tsivuku, (chid);
tanuku, danuku (tan or tap; : tasuku (tush); vaḍaku (vart); vetaku,
vedaku, vedaku, venaku, (vish); doraku (dhri); naduku (nat); naraku
(nas or nash); nūku (nud); paluku (brū); pituku, piduku (vidh, vēdh);
pisuku (pish); puḍuku, puṇuku, (puṭ); besuku (bhraś); bratuku, braḍuku
(vṛidh, vardh); minuku (miñj); etc.

b. Prefix and root *plus* 'kṛi':—utuku, uduku (uddhav); ubuku
(utplu) oluku (utsthā); beḷuku, melaku (vilas); etc.

c. Prefix *plus* root :—aḍuku, atuku, aduku, (adhi);

d. Past passive participle *plus* 'kṛi':—kuluku (kus); tsinuku.
tsiluku (chinna); toḍuku (dhṛita); toluku, tonuku, toṇuku, (dhūta);

e. Denominative : lasuku (laya).

4. KKU.

a. Prefix *plus* 'kṛi': ukku (ud).

b. Root *plus* 'kṛi': ekku (ēdh); krukku (kruñch); tsekku
(chaksh) tsokku (sukh); tikku (tij); tokku, trokku (tuj or tuḍ) or dhrish;
dakku (taj); nakku (nak); nakku (nud); pokku (plush), bokku (bhuksh);
makku (mlā); mukku (mush); vikku (vij); srukku (śush); etc.

c. Denominative; vakku (bhraś).

5. GU.

a. Root and class suffix *plus* 'kṛi': aḍagu, aṇagu, āgu (aḍ);
alagu/ahas; vīgū, īgu (vidh); eragu, eṛagu (ēsh); esagu, esavu, (ish); egu (i);
karagu (ghri); *kalagu (kṛiś); kāgu, krāgu (kāś); kōgu gōku; (kṛint); goḍagu,
gonagu (gunj); tselagu (chal); tsāgu (sādh); tunugu (trñt); tūgu (tul); torugu,

toragu, todagu (stri); perugu, pergu (vṛidh); posagu (push); maḍagu, maṇagu, maḍugu, maḍgu (mṛid); masagu (mask); saragu surugu (sri); etc.

b. Root and 5th class suffix *plus* 'kṛi' : ṭōgu, dōgu, ḍōgu (dhunu)

c. Prefix *plus* root *plus* 'kṛi' : ūgu (udvij), oḍugu (uddhṛi); osagu (upās); nigu (nivṛit); pasagu (prasar); beḍagu, velagu (vilas).

d. Past passive participle *plus* 'kṛi' : kaḍagu, kaṇagu (kṛita); tsinugu, tsirugu (chhinna); toḍagu (dhṛita); tolagu (trita); penagu (pinaddha); moragu, mōrugu mṛōgu (mukhara); etc.

e. Root *plus* 'kṛi' : dāgu (dhā); māgu, mṛāgu (mlā); māgu (mush); mṛēgu, mēgu (mrij); rēgu (rich); vīgu (vij); vēgu, vrēgu, (vyadh); sāgu (sādh); etc.

f. Denominative: mesagu (āmish); etc.

g. Adjective *plus* 'kṛi' : logu (tuchha) cf. Hindi luchhā.

The nasalization in the above examples might be 'due to (i) to the natural tendency to nasalize, (ii) to the presence of a nasal in the original root or (iii) to the addition of the *nu*, *nā* or *n* class suffix.

6. NGU

a. Root *plus* 'kṛi' : krungu kruñch, ḍangu, dangu dañś; ḍongu, dongu (dhā); ḍongu (tul), trungu trut; nangu (nas) cf. nāsikā; pongu (plut); brungu (brū), mṛangu (mṛid), etc.

b. Prefix and root *plus* 'kṛi' : uppongu (utplut), etc.

c. Denominative mringu (āmish), etc.

d. Adjective *plus* 'kṛi' : longu (tuchha) cf. Hindi luchhā; etc.

7. GU

a. Root *plus* 'kṛi' : arugu (ri); oḍugu (vyadh), (kasagu karsh or gharsh), gorugu (kshu), tserugu (śūrp); t-āgu (sādh); dzaragu, soragu (sri) dīgi ḍigu (ḍi), t-āgu (trish), tirugu (sri), perugu (vṛidh); malugu, māluḡu (mlā); arugu (kshay), alugu (resh), ilugu (riś), īgu (ij), ilugu (li), meḍugu (mṛid) etc.

b. Root itself used as base : agu (bhū), tagu (sthag); etc.

c. Root and passive particle 'ya' *plus* 'kṛi' : bijugu (brū);

d. Past passive participle *plus* 'kṛi' : kaḍugu (kshālita); kalugu (kṛita); tselagu, tselgu, selagu (chhitta); talgu (dhūta); toḍugu (dhṛita); nuḍugu (nuta); poḍugu (vṛiddha); poḍugu (pushṭha) etc.

e. Prefix and root *plus* 'kṛi' : oragu, oṛagu (udvart); visugu (vya-), vegu (vilas) etc.

f. Prefix *plus* past passive participle : uḍugu (apa- or upahata); nilugu, nīluḡu (nirvṛita) etc.

g. Adverb *plus* 'kṛi' : viḍugu, virugu (prithak) etc.

8. GGU.

a. Root *plus* 'kṛi' : iggu ij; gaggu (gad); ḍaggu, daggu (dah); diggu, diggu (ḍi); nuggu (nud); maggu, mraggu (mlā) etc.

b. Prefix and root *plus* 'kṛi' : niggu, neggu (nirvah)

9. TSU.

a. Roots 'ending in s, ś, sh, ch, ksh, etc.: alatśu (alas/; utsu (ujjh/; kalatsu (kalush/; krātsu (karś); nātsu (naś); putsu (prich/; rētsu (rich); lātsu (lash); vrētsu (vraśch) etc.

b. 4th class suffix or passive particle 'ya' with t, th, r, etc.
ētsu (ēshy); tsātsu (śādhy); nōtsu (nuty); melatsu (mīl); vētsu (vyadhy);

c. Root *plus* 'ach to be:
aḍatsu, aṇatsu, ātsu (aḍ); karatsu (ghṛi); ḍātsu, dātsu (dhā); tātsu (taḍ); tūtsu (tul); maḍatsu, maḍutsu manutsu, malatsu (mrīd) etc

d. Root *plus* 'ishy' (its) where 'i' is incremental and 'shy' or 'sy' is futural.

e. Prefix and root *plus* kach:—tōts (uday); etc.

f. Past passive participle *plus* 'v': tolatsu (dhūta or dhavalita); nalatsu (nata); etc.

g. Adjective *plus* 'ya':—lōtsu (tuccha); etc.

10. NTSU

The nasalization is entirely peculiar to Telugu. Kanarese equivalents of these roots end in 'su'.

a. Root *plus* 'ishy': īsaḍiñtsu (īrshy), kuñtu (kruñch)

b. Prefix *plus* root:—añtsu (ājñā); etc. etc.

c. Prefix and root *plus* 'ishy':—
atstsaliñtsu (ācchal); āraṭiñtsu (āraṭ); uñkiñtsu (utkṛi); uttariñtsu (utkṛi) or uttri); uppatiñtsu (utpat); uppariñtsu, uppalintsu (utplu); ukiñtsu (utsāh); ūtiñtsu (utsthā); etc.

d. Prefix and past passive participle *plus* 'ishy':—
avaghaḷiñtsu (avakṛita or avaghrishta); āvuliñtsu (avakṛita), onar ñtsu (upapanna);

e. Past passive participle *plus* 'ishy':—
aṇṭiñtsu (aṇkṛta); aggaṭiñtsu (arghita, arhita, or amhita); uddiñtsu (yukta); e.c.

f. Denominative:—igiriñtsu, iviriñtsu, chigiriñtsu, chiviriñtsu (śikhara); ivataḷiñtsu himakṛita;

g. Re-duplications of root *plus* 'ishy':—aṭamaṭiñtsu; etc.

h. *Avyaya* and past passive participle *plus* 'ishy':—
aḍakiñtsu, aṇakiñtsu, (adhaskṛita); alamaṭiñtsu (alam aṭ); alavariñtsu (alam paṭ); igiliñtsu, iviliñtsu (ihīkṛita); etc.

i. Nasalization of root-in ś, s, sh, or ksh:—uñtsu vas; etc.

SATALURU COPPER PLATE GRANT OF GUNAGA VIJAYADITYA III.

BHAVARAJ V. KRISHNA RAO, B.A., B.L.

This inscription was first published in the *Bhārati*, a Telugu monthly miscellany of Madras, (volume I, part 1, pp. 90-110) in 1924. The editorial notes were prepared by the late Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao, M.A., but his sad and untimely death prevented him from revising them and preparing the article for the press; the task of revision and giving the final form fell upon his friend and co-worker, Mr. M. Sōmasēkhara Śarma of the Andhra Encyclopaedia Office, Madras, who published the inscription under the name of the late Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao himself. This inscription being an important one and also not having been noticed by the Government Epigraphical Department in their *Annual Reports* till now, I propose to publish in English in this Journal. Some slight errors committed by the learned editor and other facts which will be discussed in the course of this paper have induced me to re-edit the inscription in English. I edit this from excellent ink impressions supplied to me kindly by my friend Mr. Somaśekhara Śarma.

The plates, it is said, were found in Sātālūru, a village in Bandaṭ tālūka, in the Krishna district, while digging old earth from a mound for carting it as manure to the fields. They were found carefully preserved in an earthen pot. It is not known in whose land these plates were discovered, but somehow they came into the hands of Mr. K. Nageswara Rao Pantulu, Editor of the *Bhārati* and the *Āndhrapatrika* who kindly passed them to late Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao, for examination and publication in his Journal. After the publication they were returned to Mr. Nageswara Rao Pantulu, and are still lying in his office.

The inscription is engraved apparently, on seven plates altogether, which are strung on a ring which was not cut by the time the plates reached Mr. Nageswara Rao Pantulu. The plates are thick and are in a good state of preservation. They measure each, $9\frac{1}{2}$ " \times 4"; there is writing on all the plates except on the first side of the first and the outer side of the last plate except for a few letters on it. The ring on which the plates were hung is of a diameter of $4\frac{1}{2}$ "; its ends are secured in a seal, the diameter of which being $2\frac{1}{2}$ ". On the surface of the seal are to be seen counter sunk in relief, the figure of a wild boar *varāha*, elephant goad *amkuśa*, sun and moon and the usual legend

'*Tribhuvanankuṣa*'. To the back of the seal where the ends of the ring are secured, there are the figures of Gaṇeśa and Lakshmi on either side in bold relief. These figures are most beautiful, and the seal as well. Lakshmana Rao says that this is the most beautiful Eastern Chālukyan or any other seal he ever saw.

The writing on the plates has been well preserved throughout. The characters employed belong to the southern class of alphabets of the time and the country to which the inscription belongs, and are known to the Epigraphists as cursive form which is later in time than the square type of letters used in the earlier period. The cursive form of alphabets acquired two shapes in the Veṅgi country, one the round and the other slanting. The former was more beautiful and therefore became more popular in course of time. Though the slanting type of letters were used till the days of Rājārāja and Vijayāditya VII., the round or the cursive form alone was popular and survived the Chālukyan epoch. Of the six grants of the time of this king including the present inscription, only the Pāmulapādu¹ and the Ūrpuṭur² grants are written in the slanting type of letters while the other four are written in the cursive form of letters. But, it might be that the Masulipatam Plates³ of the king were written in the earlier part of the king's reign, as still some older forms of letters are seen there. Though the Pōnangi Plates are written in the cursive form of letters, there is "one peculiarity", as observed by the Government Epigraphist and that is, "in the Pōnangi Plates, the top strokes of letters are formed by double dots instead of a horizontal line connecting them as in the Masulipatam Plates."⁴ It may be said, therefore, that it was in the reign of this king Vijayāditya III. that the Āndhra and Kannaḍa alphabets came to be differentiated, the former becoming cursive and round and the latter open and slanting. The writing on the plates is neatly and most beautifully done; but the writer was certainly either careless in engraving the letters or he was utterly ignorant of the language he was copying, for the result is, the charter abounds in innumerable mistakes.

The orthography calls for some remarks. The scribe has written long vowels short and short vowels long, and invariably omitted the dot denoting the *ansvāra* where it ought to have been found and placed it where it is not required. For the secondary form of *r* the scribe wrote *ri*, and this might be due to the habit of the people pronouncing the vowel *r* as *ri*. As regards individual letters, the chief points to be noted are that, *ja* is written in both the open and square as well as in the late recursive forms. The earlier form is seen in lines 5, 10 and (in words like *Kubja*, *tanuja* and

¹ Unpublished.

² *Journal of the Telugu Academy* vol. 1 pp. 140—150.

³ *Ep. Ind.* V. p. 122.

⁴ *Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy* 1909 p. 107

ātmajaḥ while the cursive form is seen side by side in lines 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 in words like *Jayasimha*, *Vishnurājah*, *Dōgarājḥ*, and *Vijayādityaḥ*. Thus it appears from the use of the two forms of this letter, as well as the appearance of the open form of the initial vowel *i*, that the earlier and the later forms of alphabets were in use in the reign of Vijayāditya III., though it might be, the earlier form was fast losing its popularity. This view finds support also in the fact that the scribe makes a difference between the latter *da* and *ḍa*, and this differentiation is particularly marked in line 45 where the two letters are to be seen side by side. The letter *ḍa* is written very much alike *da*, but with this difference: there is a loop in *ḍa* with a dot above it. The Dravidian letter *ḍ* is also seen in this record in three places (lines 54, 55 and 82) and this shows that, that peculiar sound was pronounced in the Andhra country in the 9th Century A.D.

The language of the inscription is throughout Sanskrit, being partly in prose and partly in verse. There are altogether eleven verses in lines, 17-19, 22-25, 31-37, 75-80 and 82-85, and the rest is prose. There is, however, one noteworthy fact which deserves special mention and that is the use of *champaka* metre in this grant. The poet in describing Kalivittara (Kali Vishnuvardhana V.), father of the donor of the grant, used *champaka* metre with *prāsa* in all the four *pādas* in the second letter, and this is very interesting. The use of the *prāsa* in the second letter in all the four feet is after the tradition of the Āndhra prosody. The *śloka* runs as follows:—

अरिनुपवाजिवारणपदाति महाभ्रविराममारुतः ।

परकरिकरि सुस्थितासिभरुचि प्रविनाशन भानुसन्निभः ।

गुह्यतरदीन भागवत मानवमानित कल्पपादपः ।

वरकरिगलभूमिपभुजा सिरिहाजिभुवि प्रहासते ॥

Though the *champaka* metre properly belongs to Sanskrit prosody, it was not popular at any time among the Sanskrit poets of repute and none of the great poets ever employed it, much less with *prāsa*, in the Āndhra fashion. The *champaka* metre with its peculiar features of *yati* and *prāsa* is one of the most popular metres in the Āndhra and Kannaḍa languages. In Āndhra and Kannaḍa the *prāsa* is observed in the second letter in all the four feet, and *yati* in the first and eleventh letter of every *pāda* unlike in Sanskrit. The above verse though in Sanskrit is composed very much in accordance with the Āndhra tradition. This feature is interesting as a landmark in the history of Telugu prosody. From the existence of a verse in *champaka* metre in this inscription of the Telugu country, two centuries before Nanniya Bhaṭṭa, it can be presumed that the Telugu-Sanskrit poets of the Guḍṛahāra vishaya, nay of

the Andhra country employed the *champaka* metre, with the peculiarities of the *prāsa* and probably *yati* also, in the Andhra language. But it is cannot be said with any certainty that the Telugu poets of the Ninth century of the time of Guṇaga-Vijayāditya III, used the *champaka* metre with *yati* also like Nanniya. At any rate we have to assume that the use of the *yati* was later than the use of *prāsa*, until future researches bring, to light new facts to the contrary, in the Āndhra and in Kannada languages and that the *champaka* metre with the restrictions of *yati* and *prāsa* became popular, sometime immediately in the Pre-Nanniya Epoch, in the tenth century A. D.

The facts recorded in this inscription are mostly known to us from the other grants of the king, namely the Guntur Plates,⁵ the Pōnangy Plates, Ūrputūru Grant and the unpublished Pāmūlapadu Copper plate grant noticed by late Mr. Lakshmana Rao but they have never been properly discussed. The donor of this grant is no doubt the *first* king of the dynasty to give a complete list of kings that preceded him, in a chronological order with the duration of their reigns and their exploits. Previous to this prince the kings of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty were not in the habit of giving the names of their ancestors from the beginning but were content with giving their ancestry up to three generations only. Even this king in his Masulipatam Plates did not give more than three generations, and this induces me to assign that grant to a very early period of his reign, in all probability, shortly after he established himself on the throne. In his other grants which are nearly four in number, he merely mentioned the names of his ancestors from Kubja Vishṇuvardhana, gave the duration of their reigns and a few other facts about them. But in this grant one peculiarity is noticeable and that is, this inscription gives a chronological account of the previous kings in an analytical manner. Thus the record states after the usual legendary introduction and the names of the king's predecessors that there were *five* kings of the name of Vishṇuvardhana, *two* of Jayasīrṇha, *one* by name Mangi Dōgarājā and *three* kings by the name of Vijayāditya, including the donor himself. This is certainly unusual, and this peculiar feature compels us to assume that this might be the earliest of all his grants till now discovered with the exception of the Masulipatam plates. Thus this inscription might be the first charter of the king which begins with the historical geneology and description of the kings from the days of Kubja Vishṇuvardhana, and Vijayaditya III. must, therefore, be taken to have taken considerable pains to collect all the historical information about his predecessors from the dilapidated archives of his government, and thus set up a new model for the formal charters of his dynasty. This fact abounds

with his high historic sense which was so rare in those days even amongst his contemporaries, the Rāshtrakūṭas, the Eastern Gāngas, the Western Gāngas and the Chōḷas. Verily, the Andhras may feel^a proud of this illustrious and intelligent prince who ruled over their country roughly eleven hundred years ago.

This inscription says that after Kubja Vishṇuvardhana reigned for 18 years his son *Sakala'okāśraya* Jayasimha Vallabha reigned for 33 years. Then his brother's (Indrabhattaraka) son Vishnurāja II, for 9 years; then his son Mangi Dōga (Yuva) rāja for 25 years; his son Jayasimha II: for 13 years; his younger step-brother Kokkili for six months; having ousted him, his (Kokkili's) elder (uterine) brother Vishṇuvardhana (III.) for 35 years; his son Vijayāditya (I.) for 18 years; then his son Vishṇuvardhana (IV.) ruled the Vēṅgimaṇḍala *twelve thousand* for 35 years; then his son Vijayāditya II, after destroying the Gānga race root and branch like a fierce wind, fought for twelve years against the commanders of the Vallabha king, (meaning the Rashtrakūṭa king Gōvinda III.), built 108 temples to god Śiva under his surname *Narēndreśvara*, finally wrested from his own brother Bhīma Saḷuke, the kingdom of Vēṅgi by defeating him, and ruled for *forty* years. He was succeeded by his son Kalī Vittara who reigned for eighteen months; his son was Vijayāditya (III) who was also known as *Vira makaradhvajah*, succeeded him. He weighed himself against gold several times, and pleased the brahmans by distributing it to them. He was praised by them as *Gunake nallān*, meaning probably 'the most virtuous', and reigned over the whole of the *Dakṣiṇāpatha* together with the *Trikalinga* country. This prince, it is said, at the instance of his brother Nṛipakāma who is described as born of a Haihaya princess, gave away the village of Śānta grāma on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, to one hundred brahmanas, free of all taxes and other indemnities.

Compared with the other grants of this king, both published and unpublished, there are however, some slight discrepancies, in the number of years of reign allotted to each prince that preceded him. These discrepancies are more when compared with the records of the later period. For instance Jayasimha I. is given reign a thirty years by the Paḍankalūru Grant of Ammarāja II.⁶ as well as in the Chellūru plates of Kulottunga Chola II.⁷ All the inscriptions of Vijayāditya III. on the other hand give him a reign of thirty three years. In spite of this, Dr. Fleet chose to accept the statements of some later kings and allot thirty years only to Jayasimha I.⁸ And this is certainly unjustifiable, because the earlier records

6 *Ind. Ant.* vol. VII p. 15

7 *Ind. Ant.* vol. XIV p. 55

8 *Ind. Ant.* vol. XX p. 97

are entitled to greater weight than the later ones. But there is also another view possible: it might be that Jayasinha reigned for thirty three years, and the first three years in conjunction with his father Kubja Vishnuvardhana. For some reason or other the later sovereigns might have ignored the first 3 years of his reign which fell in the reign of his father. Or it might be that there was something of three years of terrible and devastating warfare in the last part of his reign with the king of Kalinga which resulted in his ignominious defeat and death, as recorded by Dandin in his *Daśakumāracharita*. Then, the death of his brother, Indrabhattāraka after a remarkably brief rule of seven days on the battlefield, probably against a confederacy of foes led by the Eastern Ganga king Indravarman and the vanquished Vishnukundin prince, also points us to the same conclusion. Another discrepancy is about the reign of Vishnuvardhana III. While other grants of this king Vijayāditya III. give him a reign of 37 years, the present record allots to him 35 years only. This might be due to an error in composing the grant or might be due to a mistake committed in the early charters of the king and corrected afterwards in the later grants. As regards Vijayāditya II. all the records of Vijayāditya III. give him a reign of forty years except one, which gives him a reign of 41 years, and this might be due to the calculation of a few months over a half year as one year. Dr. Fleet has without any justification discarded the statements of the earlier kings which are certainly more reliable than the later ones and accepted for him a period of 44 years of rule.⁹ Thus, though a few months one way or the other do not matter much, Vijayāditya II. should be taken to have reigned only for 40 years instead of 44 years. Likewise, Vijayāditya I. is stated to have reigned for 18 years only in this record while the other inscriptions of the king give him a duration of 19 years' reign. This discrepancy, is perhaps due to a mistake committed in the calculation of dates etc. in the earlier part of the king's reign by the superintendent of the public records, but later on corrected or revised; and that is the reason why in all the other charters of the king a reign of 19 years has been uniformly given to Vijayāditya I. It is because that a systematic attempt was made to give a chronological account of the kings of the dynasty till the reign of Vijayāditya III., that I attribute this subjoined grant to the early period of Vijayāditya III's reign; at any rate, I assume it to be the earliest of all the inscriptions of the king, thus far discovered with the exception of the Masulipatam plates. Here is the table which gives at a glance the duration of the reigns of the kings that preceded Gunaga-Vijayāditya III. according to several grants his and also according to Fleet's calculation.

Names of the kings	The present Grant.	Pāmula pāḍu grant.	Gunṭar Plates.	Urpuṭuru Plates.	According to Dr. Fleet.
Kubjavishṇuvardhana I.	18 yrs	18 yrs	18 yrs	18 yrs	18 years.
*2. Jayasimha I.	33 yrs	33 „	33 „	33 „	30 „
3. Vishṇuvardhana II.	9 „	9 „	9 „	9 „	9 „
4. Maṅgiyavaraja.	25 „	25 „	25 „	25 „	25 „
5. Jayasimha II.	13 „	13 „	13 „	13 „	13 „
6. Kokkili.	6 months	6 mts	6 mts	6 mts	6 months.
7. Vishṇuvardhana III.	35 yrs	37 „	39 „	37 „	37 years.
*8. Vijayāditya I.	18 „	19 yrs	19 yrs	19 yrs	18 „
9. Vishṇuvardhana IV.	35 „	36 „	35 „	36 „	35 „
*10. Vijayāditya II.	40 „	41 „	40 „	40 „	44 „
*11. Kaliviṭṭara.	18 ms	20 ms	20 ms	20 ms	18 months.

Another interesting fact mentioned in this grant is that Vishṇuvardhana IV. ruled over Vēṅgimaṇḍala twelve thousand while nothing of that sort has been stated with reference to his father Vijayāditya I. To me, this appears to suggest that the extent of the Eastern Chalukyan kingdom was reduced in his time to Vēṅgimaṇḍala twelve thousand only, on account of incessant warfare with the Rastrakūṭas and their allies.¹⁰ The expression Vēṅgimaṇḍala twelve thousand, is inexplicable Lakshmana Rao thought it to mean, the population of the Vengimandala; while other scholars considered it to express the number of revenue paying units or *Grāmas* in the territorial division called Vēṅgimaṇḍala. I think both the theories are untenable. 'Twelve thousand' might be the amount of the revenue expressed in the coinage of the country, of the time, preferably, in gold *varāhas*. The expression cannot in any sense mean either the population or the number of villages or revenue paying units. It might also convey a sense of its extent expressed in terms of *kros* (two mile) which is a very ancient word denoting the distance; that is to say Vēṅgimaṇḍala whose area was twelve thousand square *kros*. Mr. Lakshmana Rao quotes from *Paṇḍitarādhyacharitra* of Palkurki Sōmanātha Kavi of the 13th century, a long passage wherein the extents of various countries in ancient India are described. We have several instances in the inscriptions of South India where references to the extent of the countries are given in a similar manner. For instance, we have *Sārtha-sapta-laksha* of Dakṣiṇapatha,¹¹ the *Sārtha-sapta-laksha* of Raṭṭavāḍi, Gangavāḍi ninty six thousand, Nōlatmbavāḍi

10 See my *History of Rajahmundry* in this Journal above, vol, III p. 148 where this fact was discussed at some length.

11 Ranastipundi Grant of Vimaladitya; *Ep. Ind.* vol, VI p. 352.

35,000, Banavāsi 12,000, Pākanāḍu 21,000. Though Mañchana Kavi mentions Pākanāḍu as consisting 21,000 *grāmas*,¹² grama cannot be taken to mean a village but a unit of extent or area. Nevertheless, there is no reference in any of the earlier inscriptions to Pākanāḍu with 21,000 *grāmas* prior to Manchana Kavi who flourished in the early part of the 13th century.

All the inscriptions of Guṇaga Vijayāditya III, except the Masulipatam plates mention that Vijayaditya II., surnamed Narēndramṛigarāja had a brother named Bhīma Saluke, who held Vēṅgi as a vassal of the Rāshtrakūta king and that the former wrested the kingdom from him and reigned for forty years. Dr. Fleet and Dr. Bhaṇḍarkar thought that the Vēṅgi king who was held as a vassal by the Rāshtrakūta king Gōvinda III. (A.D. 784—814) to be Vijayāditya II. (A.D. 799—840) because he happened to be his contemporary.¹³ But Vijayāditya II. cannot be taken to be the prince that paid such humiliating allegiance to Gōvinda III., that he went to build the walls of Mānyakhēta 'at the half utterance of the sentence by a messenger'. Now the subjoined grant and the other grants discovered thus far, particularly the Pāmulpāḍu, Guṇṭur and Pōnangi Plates prove that it was Bhīma Saluke who held Vēṅgi as a vassal of Gōvinda III. for a period of twelve years in all probability, and that it was from him that Vijayāditya II. wrested the kingdom after successfully carrying on a war with his brother on the one hand and the Rāshtrakūta and Western Gāṅga armies on the other. It was only during the last days of Gōvinda III. when his power was weakened and when all the powers of the north and the south entered into a confederacy and threatened to bring about the disruption of the the great Rāshtrakūta empire so powerfully built by him that Vijayaditya II. rallied his forces and drove out his brother from the country, defeated the combined armies of the Rāshtrakūtas and Gangas and become its undisputed master. To expiate for the sins, probably, of killing his own kith and kin during that twelve years of internecine warfare, that Vijayaditya II built 108 temples to the god Śiva under his own name as *Narēndreśvara-svāmin* all over Vēṅgiṃaṇḍala.

The subjoined grant mentions that Vijayaditya III. planted before the threshold of his residence, the invincible banner containing the symbols of the rivers Gangā and Yamunā, the sun and the moon, and the *pāliketana*, and that at the hearing of the five great sounds made by his troops his (Vijayāditya's) enemies were terrified. The symbols of the rivers Gangā and Yamuna as well as the *pāliketana* were the royal insignia of the Rāshtrakūtas of Mānyakhēta, acquired by Govinda III.

¹² In *Keyurabahucharitram* dedicated to Nanduri Gōvinda mantri minister to the last prince of the Velanānti family of Tsandavou.

¹³ See above vol. III p. 151 *History of Rajahmundry*.

The fact of Vijayāditya's planting the *pālādhvaja* with the symbols of the Gangā and Yamunā at his threshold seems to suggest that by the date of the grant, he defeated Rāshtrakūṭas and crushed their power completely. Vijayāditya III. seems to bear another surname *Viramākaradhvajah* in addition to those mentioned his Guntur plates, namely *Manuja prākāra Rāmaranga śātraka*, *Vikramadhavīṇa*, *Parachakrarāma*, *Nṛpati-martāṇḍa*, *Birudānka Bhīma*, *Arasanka kēsari* *Gunake nallān* and *Tripurāmaṇḍya Mahēśvara*. The last mentioned surname is also found in the Veṇṇatalūru Grant of his successor Chālukya Bhīma I.

The village granted is Śāntagrāma and is said to have been situated in the district (*viśaya*) of Gudrahāra, which is apparently identical with the modern town of Guḍivāḍa. The Gudrahāra viśaya at the time of this inscription seems to have comprised the modern tālukas of Guḍivāḍa, Kaikalūru, Masulipatam or Bandar and a little tract on the southern side of the river Krishna. It is therefore possible that Śāntagrāma, the village granted might be identified with Sātalūru in the Bandar taluk, the place where there plates were discovered and the boundary villages mentioned in the inscription help us in that direction considerably. The villages Urivi, Arutagūru, Muñjulūru and Tuñburuballi are still existing, and curiously enough with very much the identical names, excepting for slight phonetical changes. Only Arutagūru is now known as Arṭamūru and Tuñburuballi has become Tuñbiḍi. All these villages are now situated around and in the neighbourhood of Śāntagrāma, which is called today Sātalūru. The reason for the change in the name of the village granted is quite apparent. *Ūru* in Telugu, means *grāma* in Sanskrit and Śāntagrāma therefore in Telugu became Śāntalūru, which again in the lapse of time, on account of phonetical changes peculiar to the Telugu Language, became Sātalūru, the initial palatal sibilant *śā* becoming dental sibilant *sā*, and the medial *n* dropping out altogether. It might, also, be that the poet in composing the grant sanskritised the Prakrit or the original name Sātalūru (called after the half mythical and half historical ancestor of the Sātavahanas) into Śāntagrāma. But both these are mere conjectures. The village Śāntagrāma was bounded on the east by Penubūṇḍi, on the south by Arutagūru, on the south west by Muñjulūru, on the west by Urivi, on the north by Tuñburuballi and on the north-east by Muluḍupendōru. Of these villages two only, Penubūṇḍi and Muluḍupendōru are not capable of identification.

There is one expression in the grant *nāti kunṭha* which I am not able to understand. Lakshmana Rao did not notice this. The village is said to have been granted along with the *nāti kunṭha* (ll. 34 and 40). I have not been able to trace this expression to any of the Sanskrit or Telugu Dictionaries; and therefore I cannot take it to be purely either a Sanskrit or a Telugu word. It might be a compound of

two words, Sanskrit and Telugu. As we know, that *kunta* in Telugu means either a tank or a term of land measurement, we might take the expression *nāti kunṭha* to mean 'with all the tanks adjoining the village.'

The donees of the grant were all residents of villages situated in the modern Gunṭūr and Krishna districts. Vangiparru Kāramchēḍu, Karroṇa, Vagiparru, Uppuṭūru, Krāñja, Krōvaśri, Rāyūru, Kunduru, and Śrīpuram are said to be villages from which the donees came. Vangiparru and Vagiparru might be identical, the scribe having omitted the dot denoting the *anusvāra*. Except Karroṇa and Kunduru, the remaining villages are still existing with slightly altered spelling. Krāñja is Kāja, Krōvaśri is probably Kovvali and Śrīpuram is Siripuram is Tenali Tālūka.

The executor (Ājñapti) of this grant is Pāṇḍaranga, the great-grandson of Bhaṭṭakāla (ll. 82-83.). In all the grants of Vijayāditya III. Pāṇḍaranga figures as the *ājñapti*, and he is said to be the minister and commander-in-chief of the king. He is described as *Mahāgunah* "who made his enemies pay obeisance to him by the victories he had obtained with his sword." The Pōnangi plates of the king mention Kaḍeya rāya, father of Pāṇḍaranga who died fighting by the side of his master Parachakrarāma i.e. Vijayāditya III., on the battle field.

The names of the donees and their residence are given as follows:

<i>Names</i>	<i>Residence</i>	<i>Shares</i>	<i>Names</i>	<i>Residence</i>	<i>Shares</i>
<i>Gotra not mentioned.</i>			<i>Parāśara Gotra (contd.)</i>		
1 Yajñaśarman	Vangiparru	3	17 Bavvaśarman	"	1
2 Guṇḍaśarman	"	1	18 Dugaśarman	"	1/2
3 Vidaḍiśarman	"	1	19 Bhīmaśarman	"	1
4 Drōṇaśarman	"	1/2	<i>Bhāraṭvāja Gotra</i>		
<i>Kata Gotra</i>			20 Śivaśarman	Karroṇa	3
5 Budaḍiśarman	"	2	21 Rēvaśarman	"	1
6 Vennaśarman	"	2	22 Sivikuṇṇaśarman	"	1
<i>Kutsa Gotra</i>			23 Agyapaśarman	Krōva Śrī	1
7 Tūrkaśarman	Krova Śrī	2	24 Vennaśarman	"	1
8 Boppaṇaśarman	"	1	25 Guṇḍaśarman	"	1
<i>Parāśara Gotra</i>			26 Kēśavaśarman	Uppuṭūru	1
9 Drōṇaśarman	Karamichēḍu	1 1/2	27 Guṇḍaśarman	"	1
10 Kañchiśarman	"	2	28 Nāgaśarman	"	1
11 Drōṇaśarman	"	2	29 Kandaśarman	Kunduru	1
12 Baddiśarman	"	5	30 Eṇaśarman	Kāramchēḍu	1
13 Viraśarman	Uppuṭūru	1 1/2	31 Drōṇaśarman	"	1
14 Chāṃiśarman	"	1	32 Sivaśarman	"	1/2
15 Trivikarmaśarman	"	1	33 Vallavayyaśarman	"	1
16 Bhīmaśarman	"	1	34 Rēvaśarman	"	1

Names Residence Shares			Names Residence Shares		
<i>Śaṇḍila Gōtra</i>			<i>Kausika Gōtra</i>		
35	Pētaśarman	Karroṭa 1	59	Koṇḍiśarman	Uppuṭūru 2
36	Ayyappaśarman	„ 1½	68	Piṭṭamaśarman	Krāñja 1
<i>Devarata Gōtra</i>			61	Ravaṇiśarman	Krōva Śrī 1
37	Vakaśarman	„ 1	62	Drōṇaśarman	Kunduru 1
38	Savvaśarman	„ 1	<i>Kāśyapa Gōtra</i>		
39	Kuṇḍiśarman	„ 1	63	Rudvaśarman	Uppuṭūru 1
<i>Harita Gōtra</i>			64	Gōlaśarman	„ 1½
40	Rēvaśarman	Vaṇḡiparṭu 2	65	Rudvaśarman	„ 1½
41	Drōṇaśarman	„ 1½	66	Gōlaśarman	„ 1
42	Kaṁchiśarman	Kāraṁchēdu 1	67	Eṇaśarman	„ 2
43	Mahīdharaśarman	„ 1	68	Mahākālaśarman	Krañja 1
44	Dēvakaśarman	„ 1	69	Drōṇaśarman	„ 1½
45	Sankaraśarman	„ 1	70	Nārāyaṇaśarma	„ 1
46	Sabadiśarman	Śrīpuraṁ 2½	71	Bōpaśarman	Rayūru 1
<i>Kōṇḍinda (Kaundinya) Gōtra</i>			<i>Kanva Gōtra</i>		
47	Śridharaśarman	Va(ñ)giparṭu 3	72	Savvaśarman	Karaṁchēdu 2
48	Damaśarman	„ 1	73	Chāmiśarman	„ 1
49	Kēśavaśarman	„ 1	<i>Radhitara Gōtra</i>		
50	Trivikramaśarman	„ 1½	74	Nārāyaṇaśarman	Krōvaśrī 1
51	Drōṇaśarman	Krañja 1	<i>Lōhita Gōtra</i>		
52	Iṭṭugamaśarman	„ 1	75	Gōyindaśarman	Karaṁchēdu 1
53	Bhīmaśarman	„ 1	<i>Ātrēja Gōtra</i>		
54	Mādhavaṇaśarman	„ 1	76	Nārāyaṇaśarman	Uppuṭūru 3
55	Sōmaśarman	Vangiparṭu 1½	<i>Agnivēśya Gōtra</i>		
56	Drōṇaśarman	„ 1	77	Mayindamaśarman	Rāyūru 1
57	Mādhavaśarman	„ 1	<i>Gautama Gōtra</i>		
58	Drōṇaśarman	„ 1	78	Drōṇaśarman	Kunduru 1
			79	Baṭaśarman	Vangiparṭu 2

Though the grant records gift of the Village to a hundred brāhmaṇas, only 79 names are given, and the remaining 21 are left out. Probably it was due to a mistake on the part on the scribe or the composer of the grant. Of these 100 donees, 20 bear the title *Bhaṭṭa*, 30 studied the four Vedas, 30 studied three Vedas, and 20 studies one Vēda.

The name of the poet who composed grant is not mentioned. But it is said that it was inscribed by the scribe Lēkhakāditya, born of the Viśvakarma *kula*, who knew the record well. He is described as being very old, as old as the Viśvakarma himself and as having built a *Ghantaśāla* probably meaning a bell factory or a factory to manufacture styles (*ghanta*).

TEXT.¹*First plate, Second side.*

- १ स्वस्ति। श्रीमतां सकलमुवनं संस्तूय मानमानव्यस गोक्षानां^२ हरीतिपुत्रानां^३ कौ
 २ शिकी वरप्रसाद लब्धराज्यनां^४ मातृगन^५ परिपाली^६ तानां स्वामिमहासेन पादा
 ३ नुष्यातानां भगवण्णारयण^७ प्रसाद समासादित वरवर^८ हलान्छने क्षन^९ क्ष
 ४ णीवाशि^{१०} कृताराति मण्डलानां अश्रमेधावभृथस्न(१*) न पवितृ^{११} कृतवपुषां चालु
 ५ क्यानां कुलमलन्करिणोः सत्याश्रयवल्लभेन्द्रस्य भ्रतात्कुञ्ज विष्णुवर्द्धन^{१२} अष्टा
 ६ श वर्षानि^{१३} तस्यसूनुः सकललोकाश्रयो जयसिंहवल्लभः वयस्तृशद्वर्षानि^{१४}
 ७ तस्यानुजस्य डन्द्रभट्टारकस्य प्रय^{१५} तनयः विष्णुराजः नववर्षानि^{१६} तस्यसुतं^{१७}

Second plate, First side.

- ८ मंगिदौं^{१८} राजः पञ्चविंशतिवर्षानी^{१९} तस्यपुत्रः जयसिंहवल्लभः^{२०} त्रयोदश व
 ९ षणी^{२१} तस्यानुजः द्वैमातुरकोक्किलि. षण्मसात्^{२२} तस्याप्रजः विष्णुर[१*]जः स्व[१]नुजमुष्ठा
 १० त्र्य पञ्चतृश^{२३} द्दषाणी^{२४} तस्यात्मजः विजयादित्यमहाराज अष्टाद(शव*)र्षानि^{२५} तस्यत
 ११ नयः विष्णुवर्द्धनः पञ्चतृशद्वर्षाणी^{२६} द्वादशसहस्रप्रमाण वे[न]गी^{२७} मण्डलं^{२८}
 १२ मन्वपालयन्^{२९} तस्यज्येष्ठः विजयादित्यः आदित्य इव सततोदयकरि^{३०} विन्ध्याट
 १३ विव^{३१} सुवंश शताधारः मेरुरिव सुन्नवन्नीकृत^{३२} तनुः (१) हरजट(१) मकुट इ(वगं)गा
 १४ रव प्रतिबन्धन समर्त्त^{३३} सुरपतिगज इव सततदान [करी] विष्णुरि(व*) व

१. From the ink impressions supplied to me kindly by Mr. M. S. Sarma of the Telugu Encyclopaedia Office.

- २ Read *gōtrānām* ३ Read *putrānām*. ४. Read *rājyānām*
 ५. Read *gana* ६. Read *pālita*. ७. Read *Nārāyana*
 ८. Read *varāha* ९. Read *kṣana* १० Read *kṣana-vuṣṭi*
 ११. Read *pavitri* १२. The dots found by Lakshmana Rao above the letter *na*, and which he meant were inserted for denoting the *visarga* are not in fact dots but corrosions of the metal caused probably on account of rust washing on the plate.
 १३. Read *varṣāṇi*
 १४ Read *Strayas-trimśad-varṣāni*. १५. Read *priya* १६. Read *varṣāṇi*
 १७. Read *sutah*. १८. The letter '*śa*' is not clear, it looks like '*ga*'
 १९. Read *varṣāni* २०. Read *simha* २१. Read *varṣāṇi*
 २२ Read *śaṇmāsān* २३. Read *trimśa* २४. Read *varṣāni* २५. Read *varṣāṇi*
 २६. Read *trimśad-varṣāni* २७. Read *Veṅgi* २८. The annsvara after *lu* is superfluous. २९. Read *pālayat* ३०. Read *kari* ३१. Read *viva*
 ३२. Read *suvarṇavarṇī-kṛita*. ३३. Read *samarthaḥ*

Second plate, Second side.

- 15 लि रिपु मतणः³⁴ शेषमहानाग इव भूधरणक्षमभुजः महाव्रत्वि³⁵ महाशंख
 16 ध्वनि विराजनः स[कलगं*]कुल गर्जज्जलदधटकोटिविवासन विशिष्ट मा
 17 रुतः अपिचं³⁶ ³⁷श्री[मद्गर्भ]स्य मूर्त्ती³⁸ स्तुभ(ट*)मधुपस द्रोधना मोरु³⁹द्वाभ[।*]

शौर्याग्न्यु

- 18 त्पति⁴⁰ बीजप्रय⁴¹वचनमनेराकरः⁴² सर्वसन्तो[।*] कीर्त्ति⁴³ खिवल्लम स्सत्कुलप्रहम
 19 मलं सत्यवानी⁴⁴ कुमार्या [।*] विद्धद्वन्दस्यधाम प्रकटमवनिपो गोबनिस्ता[।*]रकां
 कः (॥ १*)

- 20 अष्टोत्तरशत न(रे*)न्द्रेश्वरदेव(।*)लयानां कर्त्ता द्वादश वर्ष युद्धं बलभेन्द्र दण्ड
 21 नायकैः सह भीमसलुकेन(।)मानस्व(।)नुजं निर्जित्य गुही*त वेंगिमण्डल (ः)
 चत्वारिंश⁴⁵

Third plate, First side.

- 22 द्वर्षाणि (।*) तस्य सुतः । ⁴⁶अरिनुपवाजिवारणपदाति महाभ्रविराममारुतः (*।) पर
 23 करिकरि सस्ति⁴⁷तासिभरुचि प्रविनाशन भानुसन्निभः(।*) गुरुतरदिन⁴⁸ भागवत⁴⁹
 2 म[।]नवम[।]नित कल्पपादपः (।*)वरकरिगल्लभूमिपमुजा सिरिहाजी(जि)भुवि प्रहा
 2 सते [॥ २*] कलिबिद्व नामावर्षाद्धं तस्यसूनुः विजयादित्यः अनेकतुलाधृतसुवर्ण⁵⁰
 2 दानधारासन्त(पितब्राह्म*)णानि कुर्मः गुणकेनलनिति जयगीयमानकीर्त्तिः() स
 27 नदक्षिणापथसविकलिङ्गदेशमन्वपालया(मास) एव⁵¹ पञ्चविंशुवर्द्ध(न)नामानःद्वौज
 28 यसि⁵²हनामानौ एकोमगिधूवराज (**)⁵³त्रय(।) विजयादित्य नामानः (।*) तव
 वितिय⁵⁴ वि

Third plate, Second side.

- 29 जयादित्य द्वारिप्रतिष्ठापित गंगायमुन[।*] चन्द्रादित्यहली(ल)केतन समधिगतः
 30 पञ्चमहाशब्द श्रवणविवासित मतुरा⁵⁵शश्चके वराहलान्छन वीरमकरध्वजः[॥*]

34. Read *mathanah* 35. Read *vrativa* 36. The *anusvāra* on *cha* is superfluous, 37. Metre *Śārdūlavikrīḍitā*. 38. Read *mūrti* 39. Read *nāmbho*
 40. Read *tpatti* 41. Read *priya* 42. Read *manē* 43. Read *kīrti-*
strivallabha 44. Read *vāṇi* 45. Read *rimśa* 46. Metre *Chāmpaka*
 47. Read *kara-susthī* 48. Read *dīna* 49. *Bhāgavata* 50. Read *suvarnu*
 51. Read *Evam* 52. Read *simha*. 53. Read *yuvarājah* 54. Read *tritiya*
 55. Read *chaturā*. Both the readings are good.

31 ⁵⁶सत्येनृपन्मपुत्रः कर्म⁵⁷[*]त्यागेन विक्रमेन⁵⁸ हारः [1*] नृपकाम [*] स्वाम्यनुजो
विभेभ्यो वी

32 दि[स] द्वा⁵⁹ [11३] ⁶⁰अदाङ्कुचनकन्दर्पः ग्राम⁶¹द्विजशतायतं[1]प्रेरितस्वानुजेनाथनृप

33 कामेन सूरये[1४*] ⁶²शान्तग्रामममुरं(1)जसोपग्राम⁶³विनाकरम्[1*]नाति⁶⁴पुष्टेत्तत्कं

34 हि दत्तवान्मत्त⁶⁴ भुपुरः[1५*] पुनरपितस्यै (व*) राज्ञ (:*) विशेषण⁶⁵ ॥ ⁶⁶सत्य
वचनोय (म)सुरो

35 न ससुराधिप भयाङ्कुवति सत्यवचनः (1*) शौर्य्यगुणवान्मृ [गपति]र्न सविवेकम

Fourth plate, First side

36 तितो भवति शौर्य्यगुणवान् [1*] दानविभवो रविसुतो न सपतिम्बलतो भव

37 ति दानविभवः (1*) सत्यवरशौर्य्य परदानविभवस्तु नृपकामनृपतिः प्रकृतितः[1६*]

38 विजयदित्य भूपति [*] स्वानुजेननृपकामेनप्रेरित [*] सूर्य्यग्रहण निमित्त⁶⁷स विज

39 यादित्य[*] राष्ट्रकूटप्रमुखान्कुटिबिन्⁶⁸ सर्वा निथमाज्ञापयति विदित मस्तुवा⁶⁹ स्मा

40 भिः गुद्रवा(विषये शन्तग्रामे⁷⁰नातिकुण्ठसहितं द्विजशता य)दत्तवान्[1*] वेदिवेद⁷¹

41 गेतिहास पुराणादि चतु[७५*] ष्टि कलानिशाकलेभ्य⁷²(ः) परमब्रह्मविद्भ्यःपरि⁷³तामि

42 होवाधानुष्ठानपरेभ्यः शमदमयमनियमा श्री(श्रि)त शौचाचारशील गुणगना⁷⁴

Fourth plate, Second side.

43 लंकृत शरीरपद्भ्यः धात्र्य्यमादिद्वादशादित्यसमानभ्राजित कीर्त्ती र्तिभ्य तथाहिप्रति

44 ग्राहका (ः) स्वस्ति श्रीमत् वांगिप^{७६}स्तव्याय यज्ञशर्मणे त्रयोभागाः गुण्डशर्मणे

एकोभागः

45 विदडिशर्मणे एकोभागः द्रोणशर्मणे अद्वग⁷⁵ करमिचेडु वास्तव्याय पराशरगो

46 त्राय द्रोणशर्मणे अध्यक्षकोभागः कश्चिशर्मणे द्वैभागौ द्रोणशर्मणे द्वौभागौ ब

47 दिशर्मणे पञ्चनोभागाः⁷⁶ क^{७६}वास्तव्याय भारद्वाज गोत्राय शिवन शर्मणे त्रयोभ

48 गाः रेवशर्मणे एकोभागाः⁷⁷शिविकु^{७७}शर्मणे एकोभागा⁷⁸गण्डिलगोत्राय पेतशर्मणे

56. Metre *Arya* 57. Read *karni* 58. Read *Vikramēni* 59. *d-grāmam*.

60. Metre *Anushtub* 61. Read *grāmam* 62. Metre 63. Read *grāmam*

64. Read *vānnata-bhū* 65. Read *viśeṣam* 66. Metre

67. Read *nimitam* 68. Read *kutumbinah* 69. Read *vṛṣmā*

70. Read *grāmō* 71. Read *Vēdu-ṇē lam je.* 72. Read *karēbhyaḥ*

73. Read *paritāgni* 74. Read *ganā* 75. Read *arthāmsaḥ*

76. Read *pañchamō-bhāgaḥ.* 77. Read *bhāgaḥ* 78. Read *bhāgaḥ*

49 एकोभागः अध्यप्यशर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸⁰ देवरतगोत्राय वकशर्मणै एकोभा[गः]

Fifth plate, First side.

50 सव्वशर्मणे एकोभागाः⁸⁰ कुण्डिशर्मणे एकोभागा⁸¹ वगिप⁸² स्तव्याय कतगोत्राय बु
51 दडिशर्मणे द्वौभागौ वेन्नशर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸² हरीतगोत्राय रेवशर्मणे द्वौभागौ द्रोण
52 शर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸² गोत्राय श्रीधरशर्मणे त्रयोभागाः दमशर्मणे एको[भा]
53 गा⁸³ केशवशर्मणे एकोभागः त्रिविक्रमशर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸⁴ उपपू⁸⁵ व(1) स्तव्याय कौ
54 शिकगोत्राय कोण्डिशर्मणे द्वौभागौ काश्यपगोत्राया⁸⁵ ए० द्वशर्मणे एकोभागः गो
55 ठ शर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸⁶ द्व शर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸⁶ गोत्राय महाकाठशर्मणे द्वौभागौ [द्रोण]मश[र्म]
56 कोभागः क्रंजवास्तव्याय काश्यपगोत्राय महाकाठशर्मणे द्वौभागौ [द्रोण]मश[र्म]

Fifth plate, Second side.

57 ने अर्द्धशः नारायणशर्मणे एकोभागः कौशिकगोत्राय पिटृमशर्मणे एकोभागः कोण्डिन्द
58 गोत्राय द्रोणशर्मणे एकोभागः कारमिचेडुवास्तव्याय कण्वगोत्र(1)य सर्वशर्मणे द्वौ
59 भागौ चामिशर्मणे एकोभागः हरीत गोत्र(1)य कञ्चिशर्मणे एकोभागः महिधरशर्मणे
60 एकोभागः दिवकरशर्मणे एकोभागः शंकरशर्मणे एकोभागः क्रोवश्री वास्तव्या
61 य र⁸⁷ नारायणशर्मणे एकोभागः भारद्वाजगोत्राय आग्यपशर्मणे
62 एकोभागः वेन्नशर्मणे एकोभागः गुण्डशर्मणे एकोभागः कुत्तगोत्राय तूर्कशर्मणे
63 द्वौभागौ बोपणशर्मणे एकोभागः कौशिकगोत्राय रविणशर्मणे एकोभागः कार

Sixth plate, First side.

6 श्रेडु व(1) स्तव्याय लोहितगोत्र(1)य गोयिन्दशर्मणे एकोभागः कोण्डिन्दगोत्राय इरुमश
65 र्मणे एकोभागः भीमशर्मणे एकोभागः मधुवणशर्मणे एकोभागः उपपू⁸⁵ रुवा
66 स्तव्याय भारद्वाजगोत्राय केशवशर्मणे एकोभागः गुण्डशर्मणे एकोभागः नागश
67 र्मणे एकोभागः आत्रेयगोत्राय नराय(ण*)शर्मणे त्रयोभागाः रायूरुवास्तव्या
68 य अग्निवेद्यगोत्राया⁸⁷ मयिन्दमशर्मणे एकोभागः काश्यपगोत्राय बोपशर्मणे
69 एकोभागः कुण्डुरुवास्तव्य(1)य गौतमगोत्राय द्रोणशर्मणे द्वौभागौ भारद्वाजगोत्राय क
70 न्दशर्मणे एकोभागः उपपू⁸⁶ रुवास्तव्यय⁸⁶ पराशरगोत्राय वीरशर्मणे अर्द्धशः⁸⁶ कोभागः
71 चामिशर्मणे एकोभागः त्रिविक्रमशर्मणे एको

80 Read *bhāgah*

81 Read *bhāgah*.

82 Read *ardhāmsah*.

83 Read *bhāgah*

84 Read *ardhāmsah*.

85 Read *Uppūtūru*

86 Read *gotrāya*.

87 Read *gotrāya*.

88 *Uppūtūru-vāstavayāya*

Sixth plate, Second side.

- 72 भागः ब्रह्मशर्मणे एकोभागः दुर्गशर्मणे अर्द्ध(१)शः भीमशर्मणे एकोभागः (बं)गिप^{७७},
 73 (स्त)व्यायगीतमगोत्र(१)यषटशर्मणे एकोभागः कोण्डिन्दागेत्राय सोमशर्मणे अर्द्ध^{७८}(को)
 74 भागः द्रोणशर्मणे एकोभागः माधवशर्मणे एकोभागः द्रोणशर्मणे एकोभा(गः)कुन्दुर
 75 व । स्तव्याय कौशिकगोत्राय द्रोणशर्मणे एकोभागः कारञ्चडुवास्तव्याय [भा]रद्वा^{७९}
 76 भारद्वाजगोत्राय ए^{८०}शर्मणे एकोभागः द्रोणशर्मणे एकोभागः शिव(शर्मणे) अ
 77 द्वांशः वल्लन(प्य)शर्मणे एकोभागः रेवशर्मणे एकोभागः श्रीपुरवास्तव्य(१)य हरीतगोत्रा
 78 य सबहि^{८१}र्म[णे अर्द्ध^{८२}को] द्वौभागौ ॥ भट्ट(१)नां विंशतिश्च(१)पि एकवेदा^{९०} च
 विंशति [ः]* तंशत्^{९१} त्रिवेदिन
 79 स्तद्वत् चतुर्वेदवदाश[ति^{९२}॥७४] तत्रानुष्ठीयम(१)न(१)स्ते आशीर्दत्त्वा स्वभूयते[ः]*
 सदास (घुष्ट^{९३})
 80 वेदाश्च सुखंजिवन्तुभूसुराः [॥*८] अस्यावधयः पूर्ववत्[ः]* पेनुबूण्डिसीमै[व*]
 दक्षिण(ण)तः अ^{९४}त
 81 गूरुसि(सी)मै [व*] नैरतित[ः]*^{९५}मु(मु)न्जलूहसीमै[व*] पश्चिमतः उरिविसीमै [व*]
 उत्तरतः^{९६} तुंबुरुबल्लिसि(सी)
 82 मै[व*]र^{९७}शनतः मुलडु पेन्दो^{९८}सीमै[व*] चतुरवधिक्षेत्र^{९९} दत्तवान् ॥ आह्वयि
 रस्यधर्मस्य पा
 83 ण्डरंगो महागुणः [॥*] (सा)सिधारासमुच्छिन्न विद्विद्व^{१००}न्दोपवन्दित [ः॥९*]
 कृतवान्भट्ट कालस्य
 84 पुत्रोपात्रे महि(ही)तले [॥*] गगणा^{१०१}दिगर्भसद्बुद्धिशासनं कर्मनसनम्^{१००} [॥१०*]
 लेखको
 85 लेखकादित्य (ः*) शासनस्यास्यपाण्डितः (॥*) विश्वकर्मवयोभाति घण्टाशला खकार
 कम [॥*११] बहुभि
 86 र्वसुवादत्त(१) बहुभिश्च(१)नुपालिता(॥*)यस्ययस्यदा^{१०१} भमितस्य तस्यततफलः^{१०२}
 [॥*] स्वदत्त^{१०३}
 87 परदत्तावायोहरेतु वसुन्धरः^{१०४}(॥*)षष्टिवर्ष सहस्रनि^{१०५} विषया^{१०६} जायतेक्रिमि[ः॥*]
 88 दत्तहरयिताभूमि^{१०७}

Seventh plate, Second side.

- 89 The word 'Bhāradvoja' occurs twice owing to the inadvertance of the scribe.
 90. Read *Ēka-Vedaścha*. 91. Read *trimsat*.
 92. Read *r-Vedāścha-trimsati*. 93. Probable rendering 'sadā samdhusta'
 94. Read *nmruti tah*. 95. Read *Utaratah*. 96. Read *aśānatah*.
 97. Read *Kṣētrum*. 98. Read *Vidvid-brundō*. 99. Read *gaganādi*.
 100. Read *karma-nāśanah*. 101. Read *bhūmi*. 102. Read *tudāphalam*.
 103. Read *svadattām*. 104. Read *Vasumdhārām*. 105. Read *sahasrāni*.
 106. Read *Viśṭayām*. 107 Here the inscription breaks off incompletely.

STONE INSCRIPTION NEAR SIVA TEMPLE AT SANTABOMMALI.

SRI SRI SRI LAKSHMINARAYAN HARICHANDAN JĀGADEB

RAJAH BAHADUR, RAJAH SAHEB OF TEKKALI.

The history of the Śiṣṭa Kārṇams who are a branch of Utkals inhabiting Kalingadēśa since a very long time may be considered by the historians along with the other histories. There were days when these Śiṣṭa Kārṇams made the car of Kalinga Rājya move very victoriously.

It is evident that during the time of the rule of the Kadamba dynasty the present village of Kōṭabommāli was built by a brave person in commemoration of his name Vanamāli Janna and the village was called Santabommāli. It was called so because it was the centre of trade in those days. As mentioned in Śiṣṭa Kārṇa Charitra written by Pandit D. N. Śarma, it is evident that the Śiṣṭakārṇams came to Kōṭabommāli in Ś.Ś. 805. It is nearly 1000 years since the Kadamba kings ruled over Kōṭabommāli. So we can infer that the Śiṣṭakārṇams lived in Kōṭabommāli since 945 years. The details relating to this may be well known from the article of the history of Kadamba dynasty written by me and published by the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry in its "Kalingadēśa Charitra."

There is a Śiva temple at a distance of 4 miles from Santabommāli. As the deity (Śivaliṅgam) therein shines milk-like, Āndhras call it as Pālēśvara and as it is in the form of fruit (phala) Utkals call it as Phālēśvara and thus it is called by two names. But the deity might be called by the name of Phālāksha. It is an ordinary temple. It does not look like an ancient temple if we take its architecture into consideration. It seems that this ancient and famous temple became gradually dilapidated and so it was removed and a new temple came to be constructed at the same place. By the side of the temple there is a stone containing some inscriptions. The same stone is broken into two pieces. As this stone is utilized for grinding sandal-wood paste by the archakas as well as by the people that pay visits to the temple it must have been broken. The stone containing the inscription is 4 ft. length in length, 2 feet breadth and 4 inches in thickness. There are 11 lines in Telugu script and the inscription is in Sanskrit language in, Sragdhara vṛitta.

The above stone inscription must have been found on the wall of the above temple. The constructor of the present temple (being unaware of the inscription) thinking that the fame of this charitable endow

ment would go to the inscriber of this inscription if it is kept in the present temple has put it outside.

Text of the Inscription.

- १ ओं स्वस्ति श्री शाकाब्दे
- २ [चन्द्र] राजो वसुविषय
- ३ वियच्छङ्क संख्ये प्रया
- ४ ते श्रीवत्सान्वय देवशर्म
- ५ तनयोस्त्रिनविशाले वनएँ (?) [१]
- ६ शून्या यासोमघजो
- ७ वरगुणनिलयः सूर्य्य
- ८ संसेचलाहे [दीप]
- ९ प्रादादखण्डं त्रिभु
- १० वनगुरवो शम्भवोकीर्त्ति
- ११ बाणः ॥

Brief Translation

Om! Svasti. Vasu = 8 Vishaya = 5 Viyachchanka = 12 (when the figures are written in this way figures must be calculated from right to left) Thus it will be S.S. 1258 i.e. A.D. 1367 In S.S. 1258 i.e. 1366 Christian era, during the time of Chandra Rāja Kīrtibāna the son of Dēvaśarma of Śrviatsagōtra granted a perpetual lamp in the middle of the vast jungle to Śāmbhu who is Tribhuvanaguru on Saturday which was Sankramāna day. Kīrtibāna was not a lazy person. He performed many *yajñas*. In 1336 A.D. this was under the rule of Utkal king. Therefore the donor of the perpetual lamp Kīrtibāna might have been a subordinate ruler of Utkal king. There are still people of Śrīvatsagōtra in Bommāli. At the temple there is an idol of *Mahishāsūramardanī*. It is a very old idol. Both this idol as well as the stone inscription require preservation.

There are some inscriptions and grants to state that Chandra Dēva mentioned in this inscription was subordinate to the Utkal king and that he invaded the South. It is also inferred that this brave ruler invaded up to Koṇḍaviḍu. If this fact were to be true this Chandra Dēva might be the same Chandra Dēva in Gaṇadēvi's Sasanam of Koṇḍaviḍu.

These Śiṣṭakarnams took up ministerial positions in these parts during the time of Jagadebs of Kadamba dynasty and they also became famous for their education and upholding the honour of Utkals,

GAUTAMIPUTRA SRI SATAKARNI

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

Nasik cave No. 3, has several Prakrit inscrs. referring to Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi. He is called the uprooter of Kshaharāṭa family and restorer of the glory of Śātavāhana race. By the first epithet, we may note that he destroyed the Kshaharāṭa clan that ruled over Mahārāshtra, Gujrat and C. India and thus restored Śātavāhana rule over Western-India. The Jogaltambi hoard of coins discovered (Total No. 13, 250) suggests that he turned his arms against Nahapāṇa, the King of Kshaharāṭas and killed him. $\frac{1}{3}$ of the number consists of Nahapana's own coins, while the rest consists of Nahapana's coins restruck by Gautamī-putra - Śātakarṇi. There is not a single coin of any other Prince but Nahapana's and the evidence supplied by this hoard of coins is conclusive that Śātakarṇi destroyed Nahapana and his race about 120 A.D.

The Nasik cave inscriptions tell us that he ruled over the whole country watered by the R. Godavari, Berar, Malwa, Mahārāshtra, Guzerat and Konkan. The finds of coins in the Godavari, and the Krishna Valleys, Mālwa and other places also prove the same. Vāsisthīputra Pulumavi was ruling in the west over Mahārāshtradesa with Paithon as capital, as mentioned by Ptolemy, when his father Gautamīputra was ruling over the old Andhra Desa. (Dhanakāṭa) After the death of the latter in or about 130 A. D., Pulumavi succeeded to the whole of Andhradesa. An inscription found at Amarāvati refers to his reign. Coins of this King were obtained by me at Amarāvati and Gudivada in 1924 and they bear the legend *Sī ri Va si* or Sri Vasishtiputra Pulumāvi as he is called. After his death in 158 A.D. his successors, Siva Sri and Chanda Sri ruled over Krishna and Godavari Districts and the coins of the latter (coins resembling in style those of Pulumavi) have been found in Godavari District. The next Kings, Siri Satakani and Siri Yajña ruled over both Mahārāshtra and Andhra Dēsa for, their inscriptions and coins also are found both in the West and the East. Sri Yajña Śātakarṇi was a powerful king, for his Empire extended beyond the Vindhyas as is shown by the find spots of his coins. His coins were found not only in Guzerat but also in Kathiawar and E. Malwa. Probably, he reconquered those provinces from the Kshatrapa Dynasty of Ujjain. After Yajña Siri Satakārṇi, the Śātavāhana kings seem to have lost their control over Mahārāshtradesa for, we find the inscriptions and coins of certain Abhira Kings alone in the Western provinces. This may be about 190 A.D.

The Andhra King, Gautamīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi boasted of having uprooted the entire Kshaharāta family and defeated Nahapana who was a Śāka and ruled over W. Deccan, N. Konkan, Guzerat, Sourāṣṭra and Cutch, some of which were once comprised in the Andhra Empire but which were conquered by Nahapana. The Andhra victory is proved from Nasik cave inscriptions. The provinces which were thus reconquered by Śātakarṇi were probably placed under the control of Chastana and Jayadaman who were both of Śāka origin and who probably ruled as Kṣatrapas or, Viceroys under the Andhras. The coins of these Satrap princes attest to this fact. However, during the time of the third Satrap, Rudradaman, the Andhras were again defeated. This is attested by his Junagadh inscription, in which he refers to '*Svayam abhigata Mahākshātrapa nāmnah.*' Evidently, the West and the North parts of the Andhra Empire passed under Western Satraps during the middle of 2nd century A. D. and so, the successors of Vāsistīputra Pulumāvi began to rule only over the Central and the Eastern parts of the Dekkan, where their inscriptions and coins are found in large numbers.

The Eastern Dekkan was still ruled over by the Śātavāhanas for one or two generations more. Coins of Sri Rudra, Sri Krishna, Sri Chandra and other Kings were found in Krishna and Godāvari Districts as well as in Central Provinces, but not in Western-India. About the middle of the third century A.D., the Śātavāhanas ceased to be independent rulers over the E. Dekkan also. The Ikshvakus are said to have succeeded the Andhras. The Puranas mention the Ikshvakus as Andhrabhrtyas and the Jaggayapeta Inscription tells us that Sri Vīra Purushadatta of Ikshvaku race was the Rājah of the country. The Ikshvakus are a Northern dynasty and probably in the third century A. D. they penetrated into the Dekkan and established their power at the expense of the Śātavāhanas.

From the coins discovered in Kolhāpūr in the West and those discovered in Krishna Valley, we see certain differences in types and legends. The coins found in the Western region contain certain titles like Vilivāyakura, and Sivālakra and Dr. Bhandarkar has identified them with the names of viceroys who ruled over West Andhra country but who paid homage to the Kings at Dhānyakataka. Most of the Andhra coins discovered both in the East and in the West, contain the Chaitya symbol on the obverse and the cross and balls called 'Ujjain symbol' on the reverse. The chaitya symbol is a Buddhist symbol and the Andhras who were Buddhist Patrons had it on their coins. Chāstanā and Jayadāman, the Śāka Śātraps had also the same symbols on their coins and this may suggest to us that they were the viceroys under the Andhra kings. Most of the coins discovered in Mālwa bear the symbol "cross and balls" and this suggests to us that that country was under Andhra control before Śāka conquest.

An inscription in Nasik cave No. 3 dated in the 18th regnal year of Gautāmiputra Śrī Śātakarṇi informs us that the edict was issued, from the victorious camp of the army at Vaijayanti or Banāvāsi to Viṣṇupālita, the minister of Gōvardhana (Nasik) district, by the king who is styled as the Lord of Benākataka (Dhanakataka or Amarāvati) and Gōvardhana, to the effect that a field of 200 Nivartanas (measures) of land in the village of Aparakhakali formerly belonging to Rshabhadatta, son-in-law of Nahapāna but now under his enjoyment, should be granted free of all obstacles — apravēśa, anōmarsa, alavaṇakhādaka, arāshṭrasavinayikā,—to the monks of Tiriraśmi hill.

The oral order issued by the king to Viṣṇupālita, the minister of Nasik was written by Siva Gupta, protected by Mahāswāmī, and inscribed by Tāpasi.

Another inscription, inscribed below the one noted above, records an order given to Śyāmekā, the minister of Govardhana or Nasik by the same king and his mother Gautami Balasri Mahādevi, to the effect that since the field of 100 Nivartanas in Kakhadi village formerly granted to the Bhikshus living the Dharmasetu cave constructed by Mahādevi on Tiriraśmi hill is useless and nobody is living in the village, land of 100 Nivartanas in Nagarasīma (Nasik) royal field should be granted free of all obstacles.

The oral order originally given was reduced to writing by Pratīhāri (door keeper) Loratārya in the 24th regnal year of the king.

Nasik cave No. 3 contains an inscription of Queen Bālaśrī, mother of Śātakarṇi and grand mother of Puṣumāvi dated in the 19th regnal year of which records the grant of Puṣumāvi, Nasik cave No. 3 to Bhadrāyanīya sect of Buddhist monks. At the same time, the village of Sudasaṇa in Govardhana District was granted for the maintenance of the monks of third cave by the lord of Dhanamkaṭa (Gautamiputra Śātakarṇi) and the village of Pisā Jipadaka by Puṣumāvi for painting it. In the 22nd year, in lieu of Sudasaṇa, the village of Samalipada was given by Puṣumāvi. Queen Bālaśrī's inscription describes the exploits of her son who is styled Kshatriyadarpa māna mardana, (crusher of the pride and respect of the kshatriyas), Śāka Yāvana Pālhava nisūdana, (killer of the Śākas, Yāvanas and Pālhas), Khakharāta-vamsa niravasēśhakarta, (complete destroyer of the dynasty of khakharātas) and Śātavāhana kula yaśa pratishṭāpanakarta (Founder of the glory of Śātavāhana clan). He is said to have conquered Asika (Rṣikas of Dakshināpatha), Asaka (Asmakas of lower Godavari, or Asvakas of N. W. region?) Mulaka (Paithan or Pratishṭhānapura), Surathā or Surāṣṭra (Kathiawar), Kukura (Guzerat), Aparānta (N. Konkan), Anūpa (Māhishmati), Vidarbha (W. Berar), Ākara (E. Malwa), and Avanti (W. Malwa).

He is also said to be the lord of the mountains, Vijha (E. Vindhya), Achhavata or Rkshavat (Satpura), Parivāt or Pāriyātra (W. Vindhya), Sahya or Sahyādri (N. part of W. Ghats), Kaṇhagiri or Krishnagiri (W. part of W. Ghats) Maca, Siritana (Srisaila,) Malaya (S. part of W. Ghats), Mahinda or Mahendra (E. Ghats), Setagiri or Svetagiri, and Chakora.

* From the above account, it is clear that Gautamīputra Śrī Śāta-karṇi ruled over the whole of the Dekkan extending from Malwa to Mysore and from sea to sea. He established the glory of his line by defeating *Kshaharātās*, *Śākus*, *Yāvanas*, and *Pāhlavas*, all termed as *Mlechhas* or foreigners. He also established the rules of *Varṇāśrama-dharma* (caste). Though he was a Brahmanical Hindu, he patronised Buddhism by constructing caves for Buddhist monks and endowing them richly.

The inscriptions and coins of the king clearly show that the Empire was divided into several *Rāshtras* or provinces and each province into *Vishayas* or Districts and each district into several of *Gramas* or villages. There was a hierarchy of officials with several grades. Lands were measured carefully and assessed according to fertility. The use of money was known. There were merchant guilds which organised trade and banking. There were also guilds for the several crafts. There was an efficient army led by the king or his trusted ministers.

Architecture and sculpture received royal attention. The excavations in Salsette afford the most perfect specimens of buildings, e.g. stupas, caves, chaityas, monasteries, tanks, and cisterns—all made of stone. The grant of a village by Balasrī was made for painting a cave probably with scenes taken from Jatakas. Towns were built and terraced buildings for kings and nobles. Trade and Commerce were brisk. The language of all inscriptions is Prakrit and both Brahmi and Kharostī scripts are used, the former mostly. Thus, there is ample evidence to prove that the Dekkan enjoyed a great civilisation in the 2nd century A D.

BALLALA III. AND VIJAYANAGAR.

Dr. N. VENKATA RAMANAYYA, M. A., PH. D.

I

The Rev. Father HENRI HERAS, S. J. after what seems to be a thorough and searching examination of all available evidence, has arrived at the conclusion that the city of Vijayanagar was founded by Ballāḷa III., the Hoysala King of Dvārasamudra.¹ The evidence which the Rev. Father utilises may be roughly classified under two heads: (1) Inscriptions, and (2) Chronicles. We do not propose to discuss the epigraphical aspect of the problem in the present paper. We proceed to examine the way in which Father Heras has exploited the information contained in the chronicles. They are two in number: (1) *Chronicle of Fernao Nuniz*, and (2) *The Rise of the Muhammadan Power in India* by Mahomed Kāsim Ferishta. Nuniz resided in Vijayanagar in the first half of the 16th century; and his work "contains the traditional history of the country gathered first hand on the spot, and a narrative of local and current events of the highest importance, known to him either because he himself was present or because he received the information from those who were so." It was "composed by Nuniz about the year 1536 or 1537".² Mahomed Kasim Ferishta "was born about the year 1570", "at Astrabad, on the border of the Caspian Sea". He migrated to India with his father, Gholam Ally Hindoo Shah, and reached Ahmudnuggur about 1582. He left Ahmudnuggur for good after 1587, and reached Bijāpūr "in the year 1589", where he entered the service of Ibrahim Adil Shāh II. "Ferishta seems to have finished his account of the Bijāpūr Kings in 1596."³ One would expect a historian to attach greater value to the account of Nuniz who not only resided for sometime at Vijayanagar while the city was still the seat of the Hindu Empire but "composed" his work some *Sixty* years before Ferishta. But, not so Father Heras. He accepts Ferishta's account as more trustworthy than that of Nuniz, and he explains the reasons for his preference:

"Bijāpur was indeed", says he, "the best city of Deccan for obtaining information about Vijayanagar.....The tradition respecting Vijayanagar.....was undoubtedly alive in the Adil Shāhi capital.....He (Ferishta),

1 *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History*

2 Sewell; *Forgotten Empire*: preface p. 7

3 Briggs's *Ferishta* I p. XXXIX to XLIII

therefore, had the best oral tradition possible, and the ancient Mussalman chronicles as the source of his information"⁴

The reasons of Father Heras in accepting Ferishta's account in preference to that of Nuniz are thus two in number,

(1) Bijāpur where Ferishta came to live in the last quarter of the 16th century was '*the best city of Decan for obtaining information about Vijayanagar*'

(2) Ferishta had '*the best oral tradition possible and the ancient Mussalman chronicles as the source of his information*'

It is rather strange that the Rev. Father Heras should have accepted "the oral tradition recorded by Ferishta, although he brushes aside tradition drawn from the Telugu and the Canarese sources. Some Muhammadan chronicles which have come down to our own day contradict the history of Ferishta in several places and wherever it can be tested by the evidence of inscriptions it is found to be a record of "palpable falsehoods"⁵ Therefore, we are not able to repose the same amount of confidence in Ferishta as the Rev. Heras is inclined to do. To correct the inaccuracies and misstatements of Ferishta one would have to write a bulky tome, but for the present we may offer the reader a few select instances to illustrate our point

11

FERISHTA	NUNIZ	MODERN HISTORI- ANS (Based upon inscriptions)
1 "The government of Beejanuggur had remained in one family in uninterrupted succession for seven hundred years, when Shew Rāy dying, he was succeeded by his son a minor, who did not long survive him, and left the throne to a younger brother. Not long after, died also leaving an infant only of three months old. Limraj one of the principal Ministers of the family celebrated for his wisdom and experience, became sole	According to Nuniz the kingdom of Bisnaga was founded sometime after A.D. 1330. Ten kings reigned in the city before the usurpation of Narasymgna — 1 Dehorao ruled for 7 yrs 2 Bucarao , 37 , 3 Pureoyre Desrao , x , 4 Ajarao for 43 , 5 Visarao , 6 , 6 Deorao , 25 , 7 Pimirao , 12 , 8 <i>Namelu king</i> , x , 9 Verupacrao , x , 10. Padearao , x ,	The kingdom was founded by Haridhara I in 1361 & he was succeeded by his brother Bukka I in 1356. And Bukka I ruled until 1378. His descendants ruled at Vijayanagar until A.D. 1487. Therefore, the kings of the first dynasty reigned for (1487—1336) = 151 years. Sālva Narasimha

⁴ *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History*

⁵ Heras *Aravindu Dynasty* I p. 4, foot note 6.

regent, and was cheerfully obeyed by the nobility and vassals of the kingdom for forty years. On the occasion of the young king's attaining the age of manhood, Timrāj poisoned him, and put an infant of the family on the throne, in order to have a pretence for retaining the regency in his hands. Timrāj at length dying, was succeeded in his office by his son Ramrāj who having married a daughter of Shew Rāy, added by that alliance greatly to his influence and Power." 6

(The kings of the first who usurped the dynasty ruled at Bisnaga throne in 1487 for $130 + x + x + x + x$. "The ruled until 1493. reign of Padaerao must He was succeeded by have been very short. It his son Immaḍi appears to have lasted for Narasimha who a few months only. Allow- occupied the ing 10 years for each of throne until 1505 the other three reigns whose or 1506. Narasa duration is not stated by Naik who was ap- Nuniz, We get $130 + 30 =$ pointed by Sāḷuva 160 years as the period for Narasimha as the which the princes of the regent of the king- first dynasty ruled at dom died in 1503. Bisnaga. His son Vīra-Na-

Narasimha succeeded him as the regent; later about 1506 he became the king & governed the kingdom until 1509. He was succeeded by Krish- Narasimha ruled for 44 years. He had two young sons. At the time of his death, he appointed Narasa Naik, his general as the regent of the kingdom and commanded him to place one of his two sons upon the throne. Narasa Naik enthroned his master's eldest son; but, as he was poisoned by Tymarasa, an enemy of the regent, he placed his master's second son upon the throne. He confined the young king to the fort of Penugonda, where he had him assassinated a few years later.

Narasa Naik became king, and he had five sons: (1) Busbalrao (2) Crishnarao (3) Tetarao (4) Ramyupa (5) Onamysyuaya. After the death of Narasa Naik, Busbablrao ascended the throne, and ruled for six years. He died. He was succeeded by Crisnarao. He governed the kingdom most gloriously, and died. And he was succeeded by his half-brother Tetarao, 7

who died shortly after; and he was succeeded by his cousin, Sadāśiva whose minister Rāmraj was. 8

6 *Ferishta* III. pp. 80—81.

7 *Forgotten Empire* pp. 291—295.

8 *Ibid* pp. 16—290.

On a comparison of the above three accounts, that of Ferishta is found to be least trustworthy. The readers attention is drawn to the following points:--

(1) According to Ferishta, the first dynasty held sway over Vijayanagar for *Seven hundred* years without interruption; but we learn from inscriptions, on which all the modern accounts are based, that the kingdom of Vijayanagar was founded in or about 1336 A.D. and that the first or the Sangama dynasty came to an end in 1487 A.D. Therefore, the Sangama kings reigned for $1487 - 1336 = 151$ years. The account of Nuniz is roughly in agreement with this. As the evidence of the inscriptions is most trustworthy, the statement of Ferishta must be rejected as worthless.

(2) Ferishta informs us that Shew Rāy died towards the closing years of the Sangama dynasty. He appears to believe that Shew Rāy was the last important member of the Sangama family; but neither the inscriptions nor Nuniz mention a king of this name who ruled at Vijayanagar. Even if we suppose that Sadāsiva might have been the original of Ferishta's Shew Rāy, we know that he was the last king of the Third dynasty and that he did not ascend the throne until A.D. 1543. Therefore Shew Rāy, the last Sangama king must be regarded as a myth whom the very imaginative brain of Ferishta appears to have conjured up.

(3) Even if we identify Ferishta's Shew Rāy with Sālūva Narasimha, as some writers have done, we have yet to account for the four youngsters who succeeded him. The two minor sons of Shew Rāy may be identified with the two minor sons of Śālūva Narasimha, viz Immaḍi Narasimha, and his elder brother; but the two other princes whom the regent Timrāj is said to have placed upon the throne have no room for accommodation. The inscriptions mention only Immaḍi Narasimha; but Nuniz speaks of this prince and of his elder brother. Ferishta appears to have multiplied these two princes into four for reasons best known only to himself.

(4) The regent's name according to Ferishta is Timrāj; but according to Nuniz and the inscriptions his name is Narasa Naik. Ferishta did not know even the name of the regent.

(5) We learn from Ferishta that Timrāj died sometime before A.D. 1535, and he was succeeded by his son Rāmraj. Ferishta does not leave us in doubt about the identity of Rāmraj. He is the same person who perished ultimately on the battle-field of Talikoṭa. We understand from the inscriptions and Telugu literature that Rāmarāja's father was Śrīranga, a grandson of Āravīti Bukka. Śrīranga was but an obscure nobleman, and he was not even a minister. If we identify Ferishta's Timrāj with the regent Narasa Naik, Rāmraj could not have been his son, Ferishta does not even allude to Narasa Naik's famous sons, Virat Narasimha, Krishṇa, and Achyuta.

(6) Rāmarāj is said to have married a daughter of Shew Ray. We know from the *Ramarājīyam* the names of the fathers of all the wives of Rāmarāja ; and Shew Ray is not mentioned as one of them ; but Tirumaladēvī, one of Rāmarāja's wives is said to have been as daughter of the famous emperor Krishnadēvarāya.

It is obvious from what is said above that Ferishta was almost totally ignorant of the history of Vijayanagar even during the century in which he lived. The Rev. Father Heras also admits that Ferishta's account contains "several palpable falsehoods" Ferishta, of course, does not mention Krishnadēvarāya by name. Although he describes Ibrahim Adil Shāh's defeat on the banks of the Krishna, he keeps a judicious silence over the events which followed the battle. He does not refer to the incarceration of the Bhāmini princes at Gulburga, and their subsequent release by Krishnadēvarāya. However, according to the contemporary writers, the last Bhāmini princes were imprisoned by Adil Shāh, and Krishnadēvarāya released them.⁹

FERISHTA.

NUNIZ

LAKSHMI-NARAYANA.

ii. Muhammad 'Shah Bhamuny II. (IV) died in A.D. 1518. He was succeeded by his son Ahmad Shah II. The king was 'reduced to be a mere pensioner' by Ameer Bereed ; he sold the crown-jewels, but Bereed put to death several people who were involved in the transaction. The king died in 1520. He was succeeded by Allauddin II. who contrived a plot to seize the minister ; but the project failed. The Sultan was

Full of fury, he (Crisnarao) entered the kingdom of De-queen and marched against the city of Culburgura and destroyed it and razed the fortress to the ground, and the same with many other places.' x x x x In this city of Calburgura, in the fort-

Having crossed the river Krishna (after the capture of Raichore), he burnt the country of the Mussulmans. He captured the forts of Ferozabad, Asanbad, Sagar &c. Having vangui. shed Adil Shah at Kulburga, he

9 This is mentioned by Nuniz in his History of Bisanaga but his statement is considered untrustworthy as it is contradicted by the history of Ferishta. However we have it from another contemporary, of Krishnadevaraya that he set a liberty three Bhamini Princes from prison at Gulburga after he captured the place Bhandara Lakshminarayana the author of the *Sangita Suryodaya* who was the court musician of Krishnadeva alludes to this event,

కృష్ణానుత్తీర్వసోఽయం యవజనపదం పహ్నిసాత్కృత్వస్వం

ఫేహాబాద సంబాదుడ సరసమాఖ్యాని దుగ్ధాణిశిశా

ధజ్జోన్మైః పారశీకం కలబుగపురింద్రా కృపావాదహః

కాశ్మీర్యాకృష్ణవాళ దోర్బల ఘమహిమా తీక మరత్రాక పుత్రా.

deposed and murdered in prison. Wally Ulla succeeded him. Ameer Bereed conceived a passion for his queen; he poisoned the king, and married the queen. On his death, Kalim Ulla, a son of Ahmad II. by a daughter of Yossoof Adilkhan was placed upon the throne. He was confined to the palace; and in 1526 he escaped to Bijāpūr, and later on to Ahamadanaggar.¹⁰

ress belonging to it, set at liberty, the king took three the three sons of sons of the king of the (Bhāmini) Dequem. He made the eldest king of the kingdom of Dequem, his father being dead.....The other two brothers he took with him and gave them each one an allowance, to each one every year fifty thousand gold Pardaos; and he holds them and treats them as princes and great lords, as indeed they are."¹¹

‘Lakshminārāyaṇa and Nūniz were contemporaries of Krishṇadēvarāya; and their evidence must be regarded as more trustworthy than that of Ferishta who came to live at Bijāpūr some sixty years later. Either Ferishta was ignorant of what had taken place, or he suppressed the truth and deliberately falsified history.

iii. Devarāya II and Allauddin II. The following pertains to their last war:—

FERRISHTA.

ABDUR RAZAK.

“With this host he (Dēvarāya) resolved on conquering the Bhamuny kingdom; and accordingly, in the year 847 (A.D. 1443), having crossed the river Tungabhadra suddenly, he took the fortress of Mudkul, sent his sons to beseige Rachore and Bunkapore and encamped with his army along the bank of the Krishna. From hence, he sent detachments which plundered the country as far as Sagar and Bijāpūr laying it waste with fire and sword.”¹²

A. D. 1443.: About this time, the Danaik or ministerdeparted on an expedition to the kingdom of Kulburga. Sultan Allauddin Ahmad Shah, upon learning the attempted assassination of Deo Rai, and the murder of the principal officers of the state was exceedingly rejoiced, and sent an eloquent deputy to deliver this message: “Pay me 700,000 *Varāhas*, or I will send a world subduing army into your country, and will extirpate idolatry from its lowest foundations”.

Deo Rāi, king of Bijanagar was troubled and angered at this demand and said, “Since I am alive what occasion is there if some servants have been slain?...If my enemies have conceived that weakness, loss, insecurity, and calamity have fallen upon me, they are mistaken. I am shielded by a powerful and auspicious star, and fortune is favourable to me. Now, let all that my enemy can seize from out of my dominions be considered

10 *Ferishta II* pp. 558—59

11 *Forgotten Empire* pp. 357—8

12 *The Bharati II* No. 3 p 66.

13 *Ferishta II* p 492

as booty, and made over to his Sayyids and professors; as far as me, all that I can take from his kingdom, I will make over to my falconers and brahmins." So, on both sides, armies were sent into other's country, and committed great devastations."¹⁴

Both the writers whom we have cited above are Mussalmans. Abdur Razzak was a contemporary of Dēvarāya II, and was actually present at Vijayanagar while this war was being fought. Therefore, his account of the war is to be preferred to that of Ferishta who lived at Bijāpūr, 146 years later. Here is an other instance where Ferishta falsifies history in the interests of his co-religionists.

iv. Muḡāhid and Kishen Rāy:—

FERISHTA.

SAYYID ALI.

TAZKARAT-UL-MULK.

"He also wrote to Kishen Roy, the Rāja of Beejnuggur that as some forts and districts between the Krishna and Tungabhadra were held in by them in participation, which occasioned constant disagreements, it was expected the Rāja would, for the future forego his claims to all territory east of the Tungabhadra together with the fort of Bunkapore and some other places. Kishen Roy in reply to this demand said that the forts of Rāchōre and Mudkal, and others between the rivers had for ages belonged to his family; that the king would do wisely, therefore to surrender them, confine his boundary to the north bank of the Krishna &c."

Mujahid Shah took the field in person, and arrived at Beejnuggur. The Hindus fled

"The Sultan took it into his head to exterminate the idolatry of Vijayanagar and to wage a religious war against the infidels. So with a numerous army and elephants.... He proceeded towards Vijayanagar.

When the Raya, Kapzah, who was the leader of the lords of hell, heard of the approach of the Sultan's army, being hopeless of retaining his life and possessions, was excessively terrified, and shut himself in the

Mujāhid Shah, "contemplated waging a *jihad* against the infidels in order to add splendour to the army of Islam.:. Mujāhid daily busied himself in organizing his army and then proceeded against the fort of Adoni with a large force, and laid siege to it for a year, when the garrison running short of water asked for quarter; and the Governor of the fort came out, and after obtaining a written treaty returned to the fort with Mujahid Shah's deputy, in order to evacuate and surrender the fort."

"On that same night heavy rain fell, and the fort became well supplied with water. The garrison regretted having made

before the Muslim troops. The Sultan pursued them through woods "to Seeta Bund Rameswar" Kishen Roy returned to Beejnuggar closely pursued by the Muhammadans. Mujāhid entered the streets of the town; but was strongly opposed by the Hindus. He fought a duel with a Hindu whom he slew. A general action was fought after which the Mussalmans withdrew. Peace was concluded. As Mujahid was returning to Kulbarga, he was assassinated by his uncle Daud Khan.¹⁵

fort...As a matter of necessity, the above mentioned Rāya Kapzah sent to the court of Mujāhid Shāh, a number of his most intelligent and distinguished officers; and they representing their weakness and despair, and professing obedience and submission, agreed to pay a large sum of *nal* 'hara into the royal treasury; also to deliver

peace, and applied themselves to strengthening the fort. They cut off the head of Mujāhid Shah's deputy, and putting it into a gun, fired it towards the army of Mujahid Shah."

"When Mujahid heard of the resistance of the garrison, he returned to the city of Ahsanbad, and encamped outside in order that he might enter on the following day at an auspicious hour...Next day Mujahid was found on the throne without his head."¹⁷

over to the agent of the court the keys of the fortress which was the cause of the hostilities and dispute." After this, as the Sultan was returning to Kulbarga he was assassinated by his cousin Da'ud khan.¹⁶

The three Mussalman writers whom we cited above do not agree, except on one or two points, in describing the events connected with the war. There is only one point on which they completely agree, viz that Mujāhid Shah invaded Vijayanagar territory. Regarding the causes of the war Ferishta mentions only the disagreement about the boundaries. This appears to have been a mere pretext, the real cause being a desire to wage *jihad* or religious war against the infidels in order to add splendour to the army of Islam." Here the agreement stops.

According to Ferishta, the Rāya of Vijayanagar at the time of Mujāhid's invasion was Kishen Roy or Krishṇa Rāya but according to Sayyid Ali, he was called kapzah (Buk-Kapa-Shah). There was only one king of the name of Krishnarāya at Vijayanagar, and he ascended the throne in A.D. 1509 i.e. 123 years after Mujahid's death. In making Krishnarāya a contemporary of Mujahid, Ferishta has betrayed his

¹⁵ Ferishta II pp 328-41

¹⁶ Burhan i-ma'asir

¹⁷ Ibid

appalling ignorance of the chronology of the Kings of Vijayanagar. Sayyid Ali gives more or less accurately the name of the Rāya who was the contemporary of Mujāhid. He calls him Kapzah who has correctly been identified with Bukka I.¹⁸ In fact, the reign of Bukka I. lasted until 1378 A.D.

Regarding the war, the following is the summary of Ferishta's account : Mujāhid Shah took the field in person, and arrived at Beejnugar. The Hindus fled before the Muslim troops. The Sultan pursued them through the wood to "Seeta Bund Rāmēśvar". Kishen Roy then returned to Beejnugar, and was closely pursued by the Muhammadans &c.

Sayyid Ali's account differs considerably from that of Ferishta. He does not mention the City of Vijayanagar in connection with Mujāhid's war; but he declares that Kapzah who shut himself within the fort had submitted to the Sultan without fighting. Then the Sultan returned to his kingdom. The account of *Tazkarat-ul-Mulk* differs considerably from the other two. Mujāhid who laid seige to the fort of Ādōni very nearly succeeded in taking it; but owing to the fall of rain, he was balked of his prey, and had to return to his capital Ahsanbād. The account of *Tazkarat-ul-Mulk* is more trustworthy than those of Sayyid Ali and Ferishta. Mujāhid's pursuit of the King of Vijayanagar has been declared improbable.¹⁹ It is doubtful whether he actually reached the capital of the Hindu Kingdom. There are very strong reasons for believing that the fighting centred round the fortress of Ādōni and that the Muhammadans had to retire to their country utterly discomfited. So much we learn from an inscription of 1380 A.D. "When the *Turushkas* were swarming over Ādavani *durga* and kingdom," Chennappa Oḍeyar, a nephew of Harihara II, "conquered those *Turushakas*, took possession of the *durga* (fort) and the kingdom (*rājya*), and gave them to Harihara Rāya"²⁰ He is also said to have wrested "from the hands of the Yavanas, the territory they had seized, and presented (it) as an *upāyana* to Harihara"²¹ Although the inscription is dated in 1380 A.D., the events which it records, should have taken place some two years earlier.²²

It is said in the inscription that Chennappa Oḍeyar after his victory over the Mussalmans "recieved a kingdom of his own, and

¹⁸ *The Sangama Eynasty* by M. S. Sarma (unpublished)

¹⁹ Swell *The Forgotten Empire* p 42

²⁰ *Ep. Car.* XII kg 43.

²¹ *Ibid*,

²² According to *Burhan-i-ma'asir*, the king of Vijayanagar at the time of Mujahid's invasion in A.D. 1378 was Kapza or Bukka I. A.D. 1378 was the last year of Bukka's reign. There was no Muhammadan attack upon vijayanagar kingdom not to speak of Adoni between 1378 and 1380 i.e. the date of the present inscription Therefore the seige of Adoni referred to in the inscription must have taken place in 1378 A.D.

was at peace.²³ More over, it informs us that Harihararāya " had again established the kingdom acquired by his father. "²⁴ This refers to the conquest of the territory between the Tungabhadra and the Krishna, and of Konkan with its important port Goa. The conquest must have been completed in 1380. We know from an inscription dated in 1379 A.D. ²⁵ that Harihara's army was already conquering certain parts of Konkan. The Vijayanagar army could not have invaded Konkan, unless the Muhammadans were expelled from Ādōni and its surroundings sometime earlier. Therefore, K G 43 must be taken as referring to the siege of Ādōni by Mujāhid Shah in A. D. 1378. Taking advantage of the defeat of the Muhammadan army, and the subsequent confusion at Gulburga caused by the assassination of Mujāhid, Harihara II invaded the *doab*, and Konkan which he easily conquered.

Thus, in the four instances we have chosen, Ferishta's account is shown to be untrustworthy, either on account of his ignorance of the events or due to his tendency to deliberately falsify history in the interests of the Mussalmans. A writer who betrays ignorance of the history of Vijayanagar even during the century in which he lived cannot be regarded as a trustworthy authority upon the events connected with its early days. The very fact that he mentions Kishen Roy as a contemporary Muhammad I, and Mujāhid is a sufficient proof of his gross ignorance. In spite of this, the Rev. Father Heras accepts him as a most reliable authority regarding the circumstances under which the City of Vijayanagar was founded. Even here, he cannot be trusted! And the Rev. Father Heras has leaned upon a broken reed. Ferishta informs us that " Bilal Dew convened a meeting of his kinsmen and resolved first, to secure the forts of his own country and then remove the seat among the Muhammadans .. Bilal Dew, accordingly built a strong city upon the frontiers of his dominions, and called after his son Beeja to which the word 'nuggur' or city was added, so that it is now known by the name of Beejnuggur."²⁶ Therefore, Ferishta attributes in this passage the foundation of the city of Vijayanagar to Ballala III. However in the following passage, he mentions a king of Dorasamudra who was an ally of Ballāla III.

" Bilal Dew and Kishen Naig united to their forces the troops of the Rajas of Mābir and Dwārasamudra, who were formerly tributary to the Government of Carnatic."²⁷

It is obvious that according to Ferishta, the Raja of Dwārasamudra was different from Bilal Dew, the Raja of Carnatic; but Dwārasamudra

²³ *Ep. Carn. XII Kg 43*

²⁴ *Ibid*

²⁵ *Ep. Carn. X K1 113*

²⁶ *Ferishta I p. 427*

²⁷ *Ibid*

was the capital of Ballala III. until his death in A. D. 1342. The remarks of Father Heras are noteworthy :

“ There is nevertheless one slight confusion in his account. Bilal Dew is alluded by Ferishta “Raja of Carnatic”; but he does not identify him with the Raja of Dwarsamoodra (Dorasamudra), for a little afterwards he speaks of an alliance between Bilal Dew, and Rājas of Mabīr and Dwar-Samoodra. *The chronicler most likely did not know that the Raja of Carnatic then, Ballala III. held his court and capital at Dwāra-samudra itself,*²⁸

The Rev. Father Heras has, therefore, to admit that Ferishta was ignorant of what he was writing about. Yet, he declares, “ In any case, Ballala III. is said to have built the city of Vijayanagar, calling it after his son Beeja or Vijaya”.²⁹ That is enough for him. He does not pay any heed to tradition, literature, and contemporary lithic records which unanimously attribute the building of the city to Harihara I, Bukka I, or their spiritual adviser Vidyāranya. He is prepared to ignore the total absence of epigraphic evidence regarding Ballāla III’s building of the city. We may, however, be excused if we decline to accept the recommendation of Father Heras about the accuracy and veracity of Ferishta as a historian.

III

After an examination of Nuniz’s account of the foundation of the of the city of Vijayanagar, the Rev. Father Heras rejects most of it as worthless for reasons which we do not propose to consider at present. We are, however, interested, in this connection, in what he accepts as true. He says, “ One event stands out clear, and uncontradicted by other historical documents. This event is the foundation of the city of Vijayanagar by a king who had been imprisoned by the Delhi Mussalmans, taken as a prisoner to their northern capital, and then sent back to his country in the south.³⁰ Then he attempts to show that the monarch referred to was Ballāla III. “ Does Southern Indian History,” asks the Rev. Father, “ commemorate any such monarch in the first half of the XIV century”³¹ He answers this question in the affirmative. “Vīra Ballāla III. seems to be the king pointed out by Nūniz as the founder of the city of Vijayanagar.”³² He cites the following to prove his contention.

²⁸ *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History* p. 44

²⁹ *Ibid*

³⁰ *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History* p. 41

³¹ *Ibid* pp 41—42

³² *Ibid* p 42

(1) "Ferishta relates that in the year 710 H.E, corresponding to A.D. 1310," Malik Kafur defeated "Bilal Dew, Raja of the Carnatic" "took him prisoner, and ravaged his territory." 33

(2) "An inscription of Shimoga Taluka informs us that 'after the Turuka war, on the occasion of his son Vira-Ballāla-Rāya (returning) from Dillī and entering the city (on 6 May, 1313) he released the taxes old and new.' 34

"Ballāla III, therefore, was taken prisoner to Delhi, and afterwards released by the Sultan." 35

These demand careful scrutiny:—It is true that Malik Kafur took Bilal Dew prisoner; but there is nothing in Ferishta to show that "he had been taken as a prisoner to their northern capital" Delhi. Ferishta informs us that "Mallik Kafoor returned to Delhy" in 710 H.E. corresponding to A.D. 1311. "He presented the king with 312 elephants, 20,000 horses, 96000 maunds of Gold, several boxes of jewels and pearls, and other precious effects." 36 Ferishta, however, does not mention any prisoner in this connection, not to speak of a distinguished person like Ballāla III. The evidence of the inscriptions also contradicts the statement that Ballāla III. had been taken as a prisoner to Delhi. In the inscriptions which are dated in 1311, 1312, and 1313 A.D., Ballāla III. is described as ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and happiness. Therefore, there is no support for the contention of Father Heras that Ballāla III. "was taken as a prisoner to Delhi." 37

The Shimoga inscription which Father Heras cites to clinch his argument does not at all refer to Ballāla III. The text of the inscription runs as follows:

స్వస్తి శ్రీ మత్పతాచక్రవర్తి హాయిసా శ్రీ వీరబల్లాళదేవరాయ సుఖ
రాజ్యంగెయ్యత్తమిరె తురకవిగ్రయాదల్లిడ్డిలి యందసుకళు వీర బల్లాళరాయ
చటా ప్రవేశమాదురవసరదల్లి । ప్రసూది (శం) త్వరజేష్ట సుధనశమియల్లి
కూడలియ రామనాథ దేవరిగె...ధా రాపూర్వ మాడిన ధన్యు ॥ 38

Father Heras tells us that Vira-Ballāla Rāya who returned from Delhi is Ballāla III; but this statement is not borne out by the inscription itself. Vira-Ballāla-Rāya who returned from Delhi on 6th May, A.D. 1313 was not the reigning Hoysala King. It was his father called

34 *Ibid*

35 *Ibid*

36 *Ferishta* I p. 372

37 *The Beginnings of Vijayanagara History* p. 42

38 *Ep. Carn. VII* Sh 68

Hoysana Vira-Ballāla Dēvarasa who was reigning in A.D. 1313, and he made a grant in honour of the arrival of his son. Therefore, the person who returned from Delhi in 1313 was not a king but only a prince. If we accept the statement of the Rev. Father, we have to believe that the father of Ballāla III, was called Vira-Ballāla Devarasa; but this view is contradicted by the inscriptions according to which the father of Ballāla III was Narasimha III. The former had a son called Virūpāksha Ballāla. Therefore, the Vira-Ballāla-Rāya, who, according to the present inscription, returned from Delhi in 1313 A.D. could not be Ballāla III. Again, the inscription is dated on 6th May 1313 A.D. We know from the inscriptions of Ballāla III that his reign extended from A.D. 1292 to 1342. Therefore, Vira-Ballāla-Dēvarasa, the donor of the inscription, under consideration, should be identified with Ballāla III., and Vira-Ballāla-Rāya who returned from Delhi with Virūpāksha Ballāla (the future Ballāla IV.) It is now evident that Vira-Ballāla III could not have been the king "pointed out by Nūniz as the founder of the city of Vijayanagar." The Rev. Father Heras could not have been unaware of these facts. Why he put this strange interpretation on the text of the inscription is not quite intelligible. This, however, is not the only thing of its kind.

To prove that Hosapattana is identical with Vijayanagar, Father Heras proceeds thus:—

"Now, it is a fact that the form Hosapaṭṭana does not appear in the inscriptions of Harihara I. In *one of his inscriptions* of the year 1340 found very recently Hosa-Haṁpeya Paṭṭana is mentioned. Hence, Vijayanagara in the time of Harihara I was popularly called Hosa-Haṁpeyapaṭṭana, New city of Hampe."³⁹

It is true that in an inscription of 1340 A.D., a city called Hosa-Haṁpeya-Paṭṭana is said to have been mentioned. The inscription (*Ep. No. 102/1927*)⁴⁰ in which the name Hosa-Haṁpeya-paṭṭana is said to appear is very much damaged, and the stone where the name occurs has peeled off in two places resulting in the disappearance of two or three letters. Consequently the name, Hosa-Haṁpeyan-Paṭṭana is only a conjectural restoration by the epigraphist, who is not at all certain of the correctness of his reading. The Rev Father Heras pounces upon this guess of the epigraphist and attempts to turn it to his own advantage. In his eagerness to catch at a straw, he seems to abandon his duty as a historian. The

³⁹ *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History* 57—58

⁴⁰ The inscription is referred to in the *Beginnings of Vijayanagar History* thus:—"South Indian Epigraphy Report 1927 p 112 No. 88" The reference is wrong the correct serial number of the inscription is 102 of 1927 The page is 113 and not 112.

inscription (*Ep. No. 102/1927*) is not "one of his (Harihara's) inscriptions," as Father Heras would have us believe. According to the *Report of South Indian Epigraphy*, 1927, p 113, the inscription belongs to the reign of the Hoysala king, Vīra-Ballāla, the son of Vīra-Narasīnga who had his head-quarters in Dorasamudra". It "mentions a *Mahāsāmanta* of the King of the name of Bommeya Nāyaka, governing the Nidugala-rājya, and mentions Hosa-Hampeya-paṭṭāṇa." There is absolutely no reference to Harihara in it. Again, Hosa-Hampeya-paṭṭāṇa even if it were the correct name, could not have been the same town as Hampe; for "Hosa-Hampeya-paṭṭāṇa" does not mean "the 'New city of Hampe'; but it must be rendered as "the city of New Hampe", which could not have been the same as the Hampe on the Tungabhadra. Moreover, Hosa-Hampeya-Paṭṭāṇa was included in the Nidugala-rājya, and in 1343 A.D. Hampe ought to have been the head-quarters of the *Hampe-Hastināvatī-rājya*. If Hampe and Hosa-Hampeya-Paṭṭāṇa were one and the same, the latter could not have been a provincial town in the appanage of a noble Bommeya Nāyaka of Ballāla III.'s court; for it was already in 1340, the capital of Harihara I. who could not have been a dependent of Bommeya-Nāyaka. Therefore, the identification of Hosa-Hampeya-Paṭṭāṇa with Hampe is not sound. Be that as it may. The most interesting point to be noted in this context is the daring attempt made by the Rev. Father Heras to foist this inscription (*Ep. No. 102/1927*) upon Harihara I. It is not possible for us to understand the reasons which prompted him to put the strange interpretations upon the inscriptions which have absolutely no bearing upon the subject. It may, however, be noted that they are embodied in a series of lectures which the Rev. Father has delivered 'at the University of Mysore.', for which act kindness, he publicly offers his thankfulness to Mysoreans. by publishing them in a book form!⁴¹ We refrain from suggesting any explanation.

41 *The Beginnings of Vijayanagar History: Preface.*

REVIEWS.

Vijaya Vijayanagara Charitramu.

This book in simple, easy showing Telugu, is an attempt by the author Mr. Kundūri Īśwar Dutt to present the history of Vijayanagar in an impressive manner and to bring home to the mind of the stay at home Andhra, the magnificence of the "city of victory" by giving a description of its ruins. The author also adds at the beginning a chapter dealing with the origin of Vijayanagar which though a one sided distussion seems to have been well done. The historical portion is brief but serves as a very good introduction to the beginner. The author has put in many photographs of Vijayanagar ruins and the instructive value of the book is greatly enhanced thereby. We only wish that the next edition of the book would contain a fuller discussion of the several views with regard to the origin of the empire and an account of its Literary, Social and Religious development under the various dynasties. We congratulate the author for the production of a valuable introductory work on the Vijayanagar which is a subject of ever absorbing interest.

M.R.

The Kaiḥiyat of Tadipatri.

Though the Local Records and the other manuscripts of the Mackenzie Collection have received very little attention, some scholars think that they are not worthy and useful sources of past history. The falsity theory of the entire unreliability and unworthiness of the records of that Collection has been exposed by Dr. N. Venkata Ramaniah in his studied and valuable work "Karikāla and Trilōchana". Mr. M. Sōma śēkhara Śarma, the Editor of the work under review follows up this line and shows in a convincing way, how an intelligent study of the Local Histories known as *kaiḥiyats*, can bring useful facts to lights. He gives at the beginning, a short account of Col. Mackenzie's method of collecting these records and discusses how the subjects covered by them differ from those of a modern Historical Records. The main concern of these local histories is the origin of the village, its Puranic or other connections, the

charities of Parikshits or Janamējayas, the association of the locality with the residence of great sages, temples and other beneficial institutions set up by rulers of the *Kali* age and their subordinates etc., and finally the economic distributions of land and of the village services. The village of Tāḍipatri had its origin in the time of the Vijayanagar king Praudha-dēva Rāya and was included in the Gaṇḍikōṭa Province. Yeṛa Timmā-nāyaḍu, Agent over this Province was an active partisan of Aḷiya Rāma Rāya in his usurpation of the throne of Vijayanagar. Though in the middle of the 17th century Mir Jumla was the Agent, in the time of Abu Hasan Tāna Shah of Golconda, a certain Lingappa was sent to Tāḍipatri for economic reorganisation. After the fall of the Moguls the village was included in the Cuddapah-Subha. During the rule of the Nabobs of Cuddapah, the Maharattas infested Tāḍipatri twice and collected *chauth* and annexed this province. Then came the rule of Haider and Tippoo, Towards the close of the 18 century the village of Tāḍipatri was included in the dominions of the Nizam and formed part of the districts ceded by him to the East India Company. Munro was the first principal Collector of the Tāḍipatri region. Mr. Sarma edits the *kaifiyat* in a well paragraphed order and with a valuable historical introduction. The booklet is of immense value for the construction of the later history of the Telugu Country. We congratulate the Editor for this laudable attempt, and hope he will bring to light many of these half-forgotten *kaifiyats*.


M. R.

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V]

January 1931.

[Part 3



Amaravati Sculpture depicting a Stupa.

1931

RAJAHMUNDRY.

Printed at the Razan Press,

Published by the Andhra Historical Research Society,

Annual Subscription { for Members: 3 Rupees or 6 Shillings.
for Institutions: Indian 6 Rs. Foreign: 12 Sh.

Postage 8 Annas or 1 Shilling Extra.

CONTENTS.

		Pages.
18	The Recherla Family. M. RAMA RAO, B.A., (HONS) M. R. A. S.	139—150
✓19	Buddhist Antiquities in the East Godavari District. PROF. G. JOUVEAU DUBRIEUL	151—154
20	Scope of Anthropological Researches in the Agency Division of the Andhra Districts:—The Yānādis R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.	155—162
21	Studies in Vijayanagar Polity. K. ISWAR DUTT, B.A., (Local Fund Audit Dept.)	163—172
22	Krishnadēvarāya, His Officers and Contemporaries. K. RAGHAVACHARYULU, M.A., B.L.	173—178
23	Indrabhaṭṭāraka and the Gāṅga Era M. SOMASEKARA SARMA	179—186
24	Literary Gleanings No XI, The identity of Surēśvara M. RAMAKRISHNAKAVI M.A.	187—192
25	The History of the Eastern Gāṅgas of Kalinga. Chapter I. Sources Examined. R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.	193—199
26	Gāṅga Era. R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.	200—204
	Statement of Receipts by the Treasurer.	III—VI.

ERRATA

please correct page numbers 155 to 170 into 163 to 178 E1.

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V

January 1931

Part 3.

THE RECHERLA FAMILY.

M. RAMA RAO, B. A. (HONS.) M. R. A. S.

I.

This family plays a very important part in the history of the Kākatiyas of Warangal, who flourished from the middle of the eleventh century to about 1326 A.D. One prominent feature of Kākatiya rule was their patronage of a number of warrior families. This royal patronage was fully justified in the case of this family, several members of which saved the Kākatiya dominion from imminent destruction and achieved many glorious feats on behalf of their sovereigns. The history of the Rēcherla family is comparatively obscure and very little is known about its earlier members. All the inscriptions of this family are found in the Hyderabad State. Such of them as could be obtained have been included in an Appendix at the end, and an attempt is made in this article to evolve a history of this family, based on them :—


Geneology.

Besides the inscriptions included in the Appendix, the Palampet inscription of the time of Gaṇapati also throws much light on the geneology of the Rēcherla family. No. 1 of Appendix gives the following pedigree.


Bamma
x
x
x
Muccha
|
Kāṭa
|
Kāma = Kāchāmba

No. 5 makes Bēṭa, the son of Kāma. According to the Palampet record Kāma had another son Kāṭa, whose son was Rudra. No. 2. men-

tions Nāmi Redḍi, the son of Kāma and Kāchāmba. No. 6 reveals to us Mallā Redḍi, the son of Beta. The descendants of Kāma may be thus stated.



Nos. 8 and 9 mention that Nāmi Redḍi's wife was Aitāmba and that he had two sons called Kāṭa and Kāma. According to No. 10, Gaṇapa Redḍi and Marredḍi were the sons of Kāma, while No. 11 mentions that Kāmaya, Nāmaya and Mallaya were the sons of Kāṭareddi. Thus, from the inscriptions mentioned, the following genealogy of the Rēcherla family is obtained.



It is important to note in this connection a point of dispute in the above genealogy. Messrs. Seshādrī Ramaṇa Kavulu* dispute the identity of the pedigree of Rudrasēnam of the Palampet inscription with that of Nāmi Redḍi.¹ The basis of their argument is the absence of Muccha in the genealogy of Rudra's record. Secondly, they argue that since we do not know of a brother of Nāmi Redḍi, known by the name of Kāṭa. This Kāṭa who was the father of Rudra of the Palampet record, cannot be called a son of Kāma Redḍi the fourth member of the Rēcherla family. With regard to the first argument, there seem to be more reasons

*They are two Telugu poets reputed for their zeal for historical research: Mr. Seshadri Achārya and Mr. Venkataramana Achārya.—Ed.

1 Sujāta III, pt. vi p. 402—408

for the identification of the two² pedigrees in question, rather than against it. It is no serious mistake if an ancestor of the fourth or fifth degree is omitted. Most of the Kākatiya records, for example, begin the genealogy of that dynasty from Bēta and ignore Prōla I. altogether.² A number of records of the Pallavas and Telugu Chōḍas omit several names in their genealogies. Further the most important point in favour of the identity of the two ancestries is the unanimity in both of the mention of the feats of the first ancestor. The Poets contend that the first ancestor of Rudra's pedigree was Bamma while Bhima was the Founder of Nāmi Redḍi's family. I personally examined the original estampage of the inscription No. 1 of Appendix and my reading of the name is *Bamma* and not *Bhima*. Both the Palampet and the Pillalamarri records are agreed in stating that Bamma carried away the door of Kāñchīpura.

".....*Bammā = bhidānō = bhavat | yah Kāñchī-
Nagarī-kavāta-haranam krtvā prachand = āhava krīdas-Chōḍu-na
rādhipasya krtavān mānadrūmō = nmīlanam*"

(No 1 of Appendix, ll. 11—13)

"... .. ākhi-
*pya yō yavanikā-sadriṣam kavātam |
Kāñchī-purasya samapādayad-āsu Vīra-
laksmī-vivāham-īha Kākati-vallabhasya*||

(Palampet Inscription ll. 35—38)

The second argument in the contention is weaker still. That Kāta is not mentioned elsewhere as the son of Kāma and Kāmāmbikā and as brother of Nāmireḍḍi and Bētireḍḍi is no reason why he should not be treated as such on the basis of the Palampet record. Now, where is it stated that Bētireḍḍi had a brother by name Nāmireḍḍi? The only basis for evolving that relation between them is the identity of the names of the parents of both.³

Hence, it may be concluded that the Pillalamarri and the Palampet records are two very important and at the same time complimentary sources of information about the Recherla family.

History of the family.

It has already been mentioned that Bamma was the founder of this family. He is said to have been born in a family, born of the feet of *Padmaja* or *Brahma* the creator, evidently of the fourth caste. The

² Only the Motupalli Pillar inscription of Ganapati mentions him. (Vide *Ep. Ind.* vol. XII.)

³ No. 5 of Appendix I.
Kama m. Kachamba
|
Bēta

No. 2 of Appendix I.
Kama m. Kachamba .
|
Nama

word "Padmaja" lends colour to the idea that Rēcherla family belonged to the Padmanāyaka community. While No 1 of Appendix mentions that he defeated a Chōḍa king and carried away as a trophy of war the doors of Kāñchī, the Palampet record says that he achieved this victory for his Suzerain, the Kākatiya king. It is impossible to say who this Chōḍa king was and in what year he was defeated by Bamma. But the statement of the Palampet record raises very important issues connected with the Kākatiyas. It is mentioned in that record that Kāma or Kāmachamūpati, the grandfather of Rudra was an important lieutenant of Kākati Prōla. Between this Kāmachamūpati and Bamma, there were two generations and so there must have been an interval of about three-fourths of a century. Kākati Prōla ruled between A.D. 1090 and 1160 and his father Bēta, 1090-1060. Kāṭa also might have been a contemporary of Prōla who had a very long reign. Bēta's contemporary then should have been Muccha. Then Bamma will have to be placed in the first or second quarter of the eleventh century. Generally, most Kākatiya records begin their geneology with Bēta who might have risen to political power about A.D. 1050-1060. Who then was the Kākatiya king that was the contemporary of Bamma of the Rēcherla family in the second quarter of the eleventh century? Happily the Mōṭupalli pillar inscription of Gaṇapati⁴ comes to our rescue. In that, a Prōla is mentioned before Bēta and may for convenience be called Prōla I. It must be under him that Bamma flourished and achieved the glorious feat at Kāñchī. The identity of this Prōla I. is also supported by Mr. J. Rāmāyā Pantulu.⁵ Bēta is known to have been ruling the Sabbi 1,000 district, as a subordinate of Vikramāditya VI. The question now arises whether his father Prōla I also ruled over that part and if so how a petty chieftain from near Anumakonḍa in the North-east, came into conflict with the distant Chōḍa king of Kāñchī?

Muccha, the *second* known member of the Rēcherla family seems to have had no extraordinary achievements to his credit and so does his son Kāṭa. Kāṭa's son Kāma or Kāmachamūpati seems to have been very famous in the time of Kākati Prōla. The Palampet record credits him with having slain Manthanya Guṇḍa. This latter chieftain is also referred to in the Anumakonḍa inscription of Rudra.⁶ It is said therein that Rudra had Guṇḍa shaved and branded on the chest with the crest of the boar and that he never came to the field of war inspite of Rudra's challenges. Perhaps the statement of the Palampet inscription relates the sequel of

4 *Ep. Ind. XII* p. 248.

5 Above vol. IV. pts iii and iv "The Malkapuram Inscription of Rudradeva.

6 *Ind. Ant. vol. XI*. Dr. Hultzsch identifies Manthana with a village of that name in the Nuzvid Zamindari of the Krishna district. But it is more reasonable to identify it with Manthina on the Godavary in the Nizam's Dominions to be consistent with the Evolution of the Kakatiya Empire.

this fight, which was the death of Guṇḍa at the hands of Kāmachamūpati. This general of Prōla, married Kāmāmba.

Bēta, one of the sons of Kāma was very important during the time of Kākati Rudra, the son of Prōla. No. 7 of Appendix mentions a number of titles borne by Bēta. The expression *Āmananganti-puravarisvara* occurring among them and found also in the records of his successors, indicates, perhaps, that the headquarters of the Rēcherla family was Āmanagallu, which is within fifteen miles from Anumakoṇḍa. Erakasāni was the wife of Bētireddi. No. 4 of Appendix belonging to Nāmireddi and dated Ś. Ś. 1117 (A. D. 1195) mentions no titles of his, while No. 3 of Appendix which also belongs to him and dated Ś. Ś. 1124 (A. D. 1202) does so. That means that the hereditary titles must have been transferred to Nāmireddi at some time between Ś. Ś. 1195 and 1202, probably owing to the death of his elder brother, (as the titles themselves indicate) Bētireddi. Since Bētireddi was the first, as far as it is known, to bear these titles, he must have been a very useful and active general of Kākati Rudra. Rudra is said to have been killed in a war with the Yādava king Jaitugi about A. D. 1195.7 Bētireddi might have suffered the same fate. Or more probably he accompanied Mahādēva, the brother and successor of Kākati Rudra, to the battlefield and was slain by the Yādavas along with the new sovereign. Bētireddi's wife Erakasāni made many charities to the Pillalmarri temple.

Nāmireddi was also patronised by Kākati Rudra and flourished in his reign, in that of Mahādēva and in the early part of Gaṇapati's reign. He was more pious than valorous and was old during the reign of Gaṇapati when great confusion prevailed in the Kākatiya kingdom after the death of Kākati Rudra I. (*vide* the Palampet record), and many rival chieftains invaded the country, and when Rudrasēnāni and others were busy repelling these enemies; Nāmireddi was not seen in the thick of the fight but was founding temples and making gifts to them. His latest known date is A. D. 1202, and probably he died very soon after that.

Of the members of the *sixth* generation of the Rēcherla family, Rudra or Rudrasēnāni seem to be the most important. He was the greatest member of his family and was one of the mainstays of the empire of Gaṇapati, the son and successor of Mahādēva and the nephew of Kākati Rudra. According to the Palampet inscription "when Rudra (the Kākatiya king) went to heaven, many enemies tried to conquer his territory". Then the general Rudra rose equal to the occasion and by defeating Nāgati-bhūpāla, who fled from the field, he drove away all the invaders and thus

"by removing the thorns that lay in the way of the feet of the Kākatiya king, restored it on to a firm basis". As a reward, his sovereign gave him "a throne and the paraphernalia of a *Māṇḍalika*". These exploits of Rudra must have taken place between A. D. 1199 and 1209, during which period Gaṇapati was a captive at the Yādava court of Dēvagiri. Rudra was thus the first "Restorer of the Kākatiya king." He occupied such a prominent place in the kingdom that he was described as having "borne with success, the burden of the Kākatiya realm".² (*Kākati-rājya-bhāra-āhurā-jumḍu*). He took a leading part in the various campaigns of Gaṇapati. Thus Rājeya Nāyaka, one of the subordinates of Rudra killed hordes of warriors at Bokkera, which place Dr. Barnett identifies with the Bokkara of the Ganjām District; worshipped the feet of Dākṣarāma Bhīmēśvara and captured Udayagiri, in the Nellore District. This shows that both the generals and his subordinates were present in Gaṇapati's invasions of Kalinga, Velanāṇḍu and Nellore. Besides this magnificent martial glory, the name of Rēcherla Rudra is also associated with a number of pious and benevolent activities. The Uparpalle Inscription mentions that he consecrated god Rudrēśvara at Ōrugallu, the Kākatiya capital and gave the village of Nekkonḍa as a gift; and constructed a great city in which he constructed another temple to Rudrēśvara and granted the villages of Uparpalle and Borlapalle to the god in S.S. 1135 (A. D. 1213.)

It is not known if the general Rudra had any children as is the case with Mallāreḍḍi, son of Bētireḍḍi. So the *seventh* generation of the Rēcherla family was continued to the grandchildren of Nāmireḍḍi. Inscriptions show that these lived in the reign of Gaṇapati the and latest obtainable date of the Rēcherla family is S. 1180 or A. D. 1258 towards the close of Gaṇapati's reign

II.

We have thus far traced the history of the Rēcherla family from inscriptions. This family has been mentioned to have flourished under the Kākatiya sovereigns up to the end of Gaṇapati's reign. There was another family of the same name which played a prominent part in the history of the Telugu Country during the 14th and 15th centuries. This later Rēcherla family rose to power immediately after the fall of Pratāpa Rudra of Warangal, occupied the Northern and North-eastern parts of the Kākatiya Empire and ruled as an independent power. It is necessary in this connection to note one important difference between the *two* Rēcherla families. The word "*Rēcherla*" appearing differently as "*Rēcheruvula*," "*Rēcherumala*", "*Rēcherrula*" and "*Rēsarla*" stands as a surname with

regard to the earlier family. In the case of the latter, however, it indicates the name of a *gotra* adopted by a ruling family.⁹ The fact, that the same word indicates a surname in one and the name of a *gotra* in another, seems curious and it is not possible to explain this anamoly.

Several people, notably the authors of the "*Velugotvāri vamsāvali*", a traditional history of the modern rulers of Venkaṭagiri, have failed to realise this subtle difference. They have concluded that both the earlier and later families were connected and attempted to evolve a comprehensive geneology. The book states that the founder of the Rēcherla family was a certain Bētireḍḍi alias Chevviṛeḍḍi and identifies him with Bētireḍḍi, son of Kāmachamūpati. This is against all facts of history. The founder of the earlier family was Bamma and not Bētireḍḍi as shown in the preceeding pages. Nor can Bētireḍḍi be considered to have originated the later family because he had a son called Mallāreḍḍi, whose name neither tallies with that of any of the members of the second generation given in the "History of the Venkaṭagiri Chiefs, nor does Mallā Redḍi figure in it.¹⁰ The history identifies Bētireḍḍi with Brahmanāyaḍu the hero of the Palnāḍu War. The following facts are thus clear about Bētireḍḍi.—


1. That he founded the Rēcherla family.
2. That he played a prominent part in the Palnāḍ war.
3. That he was patronised by Gaṇapati.

The first conclusion has already been shown to be wrong. Nor does it seem possible to admit the identity of Bētireḍḍi and Brahmanāyaḍu. From the "*Palnāti Vīra Charitram*" we know that Brahmanāyaḍu was the son of Doḍḍanayaḍu and that his only son was Bālanāyaḍu (Balachandruḍu) who died in the war. The following shows the absurdity of the second conclusion.

9 Recharla-gōtram teshvākam Kākatīya-nripārchitam (*The Ainavolu Ins.*)
 Recherla-vamsōd-bhava-varya (*The Rachakonda Ins. of Anapota*)
 Recherla-vamsa-dugdhā-bdhi sudhā.karundaina Sri Mādhavendrumḍu
 (*Ummahswei Ins of Madanayaka*)

10 The following are the members of the Recheṣṭa family figuring in the History of the Venkaṭagiri Chiefs :—

I generation	Bēti Redḍi alias Bētālanāyaḍu	
II generation	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> { Damanayaḍu Prasadedityanayaḍu Rudramanayaḍu } </div>	Flourished in the reign of Rudramba
III generation	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> { Vennamanayaḍu Sabbinayaḍu } </div>	
IV generation	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> { Yerradāchanayaḍu Nalladāchanayaḍu Singamanayaḍu } </div>	Flourished in the reign of Pratapaṛadma
V generation	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> { Vennamanayaḍu Yachanamanayaḍu } </div>	



The third conclusion of the history is suggestive. It is said that the original name of Bētiredḍi was changed into Bēṭalanayaka and that Bēṭa's successors continued to be called Nāyakas. This statement has a great significance and furnishes the clue to a possible origin of Bētiredḍi's family. Brahmanāyaḍu of the Palnāḍ War was the protagonist of a great communal fusion. It is said that he gathered many members from various communities and formed a new cosmopolitan one. This new community, which branched off from the Redḍis, came to be called the *Padmanāyakas*. The fact of Bētiredḍi becoming Bēṭalanayaka and his successors calling themselves by the term "Nayaka" which is distinctively a *Padmanāyaka* name-ending, indicates perhaps that Bētiredḍi and his family were converts to the new community. The Palnāḍ War seems to have taken place about A.D. 1176-1181. So the rise of this Padmanāyaka family must be dated about A. D. 1180, when Brahma Nayaḍu was busy getting converts.

The Rēcherla family of the Pillalamarri inscription was also flourishing at this time. Its members had their names ending in 'Redḍi'. They are known, from inscriptions, to have continued till the end of Gaṇapati's reign. The family of Bētiredḍi alias Bēṭalanāyaka was bearing names ending in Nāyakas. They only rose about the year A. D. 1180. They were also Kākatiya subordinates and their first member Bēṭa is said to have been patronised by Gaṇapati. This later family cannot be said to have been ruling at Pillalamarri as the "*History of the Venkatagiri Chiefs*" states, because the family of Bammāsēnani was already established there and continued to be there till almost the close of Gaṇapati's reign. Under these circumstances, it will not be far wrong to suppose that one of the several families that was merged into the *Padmanāyaka* community soon after the Palnāḍu war, rose to fame under Bēṭala Nāyaka and became Kākatiya subordinates. That no information is forthcoming about the Pillalamarri family after Gaṇapati's reign indicates perhaps that the family lost its prominence and was displaced by the later *Padmanāyaka* family which settled about Rājakoṇḍa in the Nizam's Dominions.

From the accounts of the *History of Venkatagiri chiefs*, however inconsistent, it might be, Prāsādāditya, son of Bēṭala Nayaḍu appears to have been the real founder of the greatness of his family. The "*Rāvu Vamṣīya charitram*" also gives some information about this chieftain. According to one account he received great honours from Rudradēva, having repelled a powerful enemy who besieged Warangal; while according to another, the honour was done to him by Gaṇapati. Since we continue

to hear of the Pillalamarri family till about A. D. 1250. We may approximately date the rise of Bētāla Nāyaka about that time. In that case Prasādāditya will have to be placed after Gaṇapati's reign. Rudra, his sovereign would then be Rudrāmba. Hence, we might state that Prasādāditya and his brother Rudrama Nāyaḍu, both members of the *second* generation, flourished under Rudrāmba. Immediately after the Queen's accession there was trouble in the kingdom owing to foreign invasions and internal rebellions. While the Kayasthas rebelled in the Gandikōṭa region, the Yādavas of Dēvagiri invaded from the North and according to tradition, besieged the capital; perhaps it was on this occasion that Prasādāditya drove away the enemy, whom the other *seventy six* Padmanāyaka families dreaded. Rudramanāyaka also was very famous. He is said to have had the title "*Kākatirājya-pratiṣṭhāpanāchārya*".

The members of the *fourth* and *fifth* generations became very famous during the reign of Pratāpa Rudra. Erṇa Dāchā Nāyaḍu seems to have been very famous. He accompanied Muppiḍi Nāyaka, the generalissimo of Pratāpa Rudra, in the invasion of Kāñchī. Dācha is said to have inflicted a crushing defeat on the Pāṇḍyas, taken their elephants and treasures, including a gem as big as one's palm. Pleased with this achievement of the general, Pratāpa Rudra confirmed on him the titles. "*Pañcha-Pāṇḍya-dala-viphāla*" and "*Kāñchī-kavāta-chūra-kāra*". So for the history of this *Padmanāyaka* family has been evolved by taking stray and conflicting facts of the *History of Venkatagiri Chiefs* and reconciling them with the history of the Kākatīyas.

With Singama Nāyaka of the *fifth* generation, we are on firmer ground. This Singama Nāyaka the grandfather of Anapōta Nāyaka I. seems to have proclaimed independence immediately after the fall of Pratāpa Rudra of Warangal in 1323. Evidently he was a general in the services of the last Kākatīya monarch and was one of the several other Kākatīya generals and officials who rose to power after the fall of Warangal. (Cf. Prōlaya Vēmā Redḍi and Hukka and Bukka). The Singama Nāyaka mentioned above, played a prominent part in the reign of Pratāpa Rudra. He is mentioned in a Canarese manuscript dealing with the history of the Kampili kingdom." The story runs thus:—

Kumāra Rāma, the Prince of Kampili, puffed up with pride owing to his victorious compigns, harassed the Hoysala borders and challenged the Hoysala king to battle. He came to Warangal and requested Vīra Rudra to aid him in his campaigns. Rudra refused help and thereon, the insolent prince assumed titles offensive to the Kākatīya monarch. Rudra sent his forces on Kampili and a fight ensued, in which the Kākatīyas were defeated. Singama is mentioned to have lead the Telugu forces in that war.

But the story seems to have been exaggerated towards the end. It is said that after the close of the war, Rāmanātha ceded several horses to

Singama and made many presents to him. This unusual fact of a victor giving presents to the vanquished shows clearly, that the success of the battle was not that of Kampili. Nothing more is known about Singama as a Kākatiya general. He must have played a prominent part the deadly struggles against the Mahommedans, during the reign of Pratāpa Rudra. When that monarch fell, he proclaimed himself independent master of the Rājkonḍa region and thus founded the later Rēcherla family.

Conclusion.

Thus a family of valiant generals bearing the surname "Rēcherla" were serving under the Kākatiyas from the earliest times. They made many glorious conquests for their sovereigns and saved the empire during critical times. This family seems to have gone into obscurity after the death of the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati. They were evidency members of the Redḍi community. No more reliable evidence is available about the Rēcherla family till the reign of Pratāpa Rudra. In his reign, a Singama Nāyaka figures but he belongs to a different Rēcherla family which bore the *gōtra* called Rēcherla. These later were evidently Velamas of the *Padmanāyaka* community. The earlier family mention nothing more about their community, beyond stating that they were born from the feet of *Padmaja* or *Brahma*. The names of several members of the family ending in "Redḍi" in contradistinction to the "Nāyaka" of the later family, seem to be suggestive and perhaps show their Redḍi connection. What sort of relation exists between the two families and why the word "Rēcherla" happened to be the name of one family and name of the *Gōtra* to another, it is difficult to determine. The data given in the history of the Venkatagiri Chiefs with regard to their early ancestry in most unreliable and confusingly wrong. Unless future researches bring to light reliable and strong evidences to prove the identity of the earlier and later families, they must be considered as distinctly separate. It must be proved that the names of the early ancestors of Singama were identical with the descendants of the *Seventh* generation of the earlier family. Even then the difference in the name endings of the two families remains to be explained. Till then the family of Bamma may be called the earlier and that of Singama Nāyaka, the later Rēcherla families.

APPENDIX.

The *twelve* inscriptions included in this Appendix are all from the Nizams Dominions. I have given here my own readings of the inscriptions, the original estampages of which are preserved in the archives of the *Hyderabad Historical Society*. They are of much value to the history of the Kākatiyas and are mostly unknown. I am very grateful to the *Hyderabad Historical Society* for having permitted me to publish these important records. I have only taken the liberty of omitting such parts of the records that contain enumerations of the details of grants. I give below an abstract of contents of these inscriptions.

•
Abstract of Contents.

No. 1. From the feet of Brahma came a family in which was born a king called Bamma who carried away the door of Kāñchī and uprooted the tree of honour of the Chōḍa King. (l. 10—13)

In that family was born Muccha known all over the universe for his glory. (l. 18—19)

His son was Kāṭa who married Kāchāmbikā.

No. 2. Nāma was well known for his charities. His wife was Aitama and his parents Kāmaya and Kāchambā. He received his glory and power from king Gaṇapati.

No. 3. Rēcherumala Nāmi Redḍi consecrated Nāmēśvaradēva at Pillalamarri and made many gifts to the god in S.S. 1124, on Saturday the 14th day of the bright half of the month of *Chaitra* in the cyclic year *Dundubhi*. His wife Aitama also gave gifts to the god.

No. 4. While Rudradēva was ruling the kingdom, Nāma who got his wealth by the grace of that monarch, instituted at Pillalamarri three "lingas" known after the name of his parents and of himself and gave gifts of land to the gods in S. S. 1117, on Sunday the thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of *Vaiśākha* the cyclic year *Rākshasa*.

No. 5. From the feet of Brahma came a family in which was born Bamma who was famed for his charities and martial valour. In that line came Muccha and his son was Kāṭa. His son was Kāma whose wife Kācha. Their son was Bēta, a devotee of the feet of Mahādēva and his wife was Erakka.

No. 6. Erakka was the ideal of charity and chastity. His son was Malla, equally skilled at learning and arms. In the Saka year counted by Sky, Rama, Moon and Earth, on Monday the eleventh day of the bright half of *Jyēṣṭha* of the cyclic year *Vibhava*, she instituted god Erakēśvara at Pillalamarri and made many gifts.

No. 7 Registers gifts of Erakasāni wife of Rēcherla Bēti Redḍi, to Erakēśvara whom she had instituted; the record bears the date S. 1130.

No. 8. Registers that during the reign of Kākati Gaṇapatidēva Mahārāja., Māṇḍalika Rēcherla Katreddi son of Aitāmbikā instituted Nāmēśvara, Aiteśvara and Kātēśvara after the names of his parents and of himself and gave them gifts in S. 1156, on a Thursday the thirteenth of the bright half of *Vaiśākha* in the cyclic year *Jaya*.

No. 9. Registers a gifts by Rēcherla Kāmi Redḍi son of Aitāmbikā, in S. 1180.

No. 10. Registers gift of Gaṇapa Reddi and Maṛreddi in the cyclic year *Raktākṣi* for the merits of their mother Kāmasāni, father Kāmi Redḍi and of themselves,

No. 11. Registers the joint gift of Kāmaya, Nāmaya and Mallaya for the merits of their parents Kātreddi and Pāra Sāni and of themselves. They also made individual gifts to the gods at Pillalmari.

No. 12. Registers a gifts for merits of Kākatiya Gaṇapatidēva and Rēcheṭṭula Rudra Redḍi.

TEXTS.

I. Pillalmarri.

- 1 శ్రీమత్సురేంద్ర దైత్యేంద్ర మునీంద్ర గణపదితం । సర్వసం
- 2 పత్రపదం వందే శంభో పాదాంబుజద్వయం ॥ శంభోశ్శుం
- 3 భరిజ్యంభయద్గణముదం సంధ్యాంధకారం మనత్సర్వాస్సుమ్మ
- 4 నువర్వపర్వత రు చీన్సుర్వాణ ముర్వీధరాకా । భూపాభూ
- 5 తభుజంగపుంగవ ఘనప్రోల్లాస పుల్లత్ఫణాకతోద్వద్య
- 6 తిపుంజరంజిత నభోజిజ్జండలం తాండవం ॥ పత్రంపుష్పంసలిల
- 7 మధవాయత్పణాం భోజయ్యగ్నే భక్త్యాదత్త్యాత రతిపురుషో
- 8 భూరిసంసారదుఃఖం । సర్వోత్పత్తిస్థితివిధవైక స్సర్వలోకైక
- 9 వంద్యస్సర్వాత్మావస్సభవతుముదే సర్వదాపార్వతీశః ॥
- 10 శ్రీమత్పద్మజపాదయగ్మయగళా ల్లోకత్రయాభ్యర్చితాదుమ్భా
- 11 తేవిపులేకులేసరవరోబమ్మభిదానోభవత్ । యఃకాంచీ
- 12 నగరీకవాటహరణం కృత్వాప్రచండాహవక్షీడశ్చోడన
- 13 రాధిపస్యకృతవాన్మానద్రుమోస్మీలనం ॥ రైలానాం శుంగ
- 14 శృంగప్రతరమురుదృషద్వర్గదుర్గంగుహాఘం శ్రోహో
- 15 ద్భూతప్రవృత్తాత్ఫణఘణి నికరస్సారపూత్కారఘో
- 16 రం । కాంతారం తారకంతారివ వరముఖరం దీప్తదావా
- 17 గ్నియుక్తం యద్భీతాస్త్యక్తయుద్ధాః పర సరపతయ
- 18 స్సంభ్రమేణాశ్రయంతః । ముచ్చస్సముచితగుణాః
- 19 ఖలు తత్కులేభూద్విశ్వంభరావలయ విశ్రుతపుణ్యకీర్తిః ।
- 20 ఆపద్గతార్తిహరణే చ మహారణే చ లోకాంతరే వితరణే
- 21 చ సదాఽట్యుః ॥ విద్యుద్వారస్సులింగ ప్రకరపరిగత
- 22 ప్రావృడాకాశదేశే ప్రోద్దామద్ధోమధూమ ప్రవితత వి
- 23 తతాకాలకాలాంబుదశ్రీః । యత్సేనాభిస్సమిద్ధస్సరభ (To be continued)

BUDDHIST ANTIQUITIES IN THE EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

PROF. G. JOUVEAU DUBREUIL.

The following are the list of villages in the East Godāvāri District, where Buddhist Antiquities can be discovered.

"TIMMĀPURAM : SEWELL: *List of Copper Plates* (Antiquarian Remains, vol. II., *Impl. Series*, n. viii), 1884. *Errata and Addenda*, p. 262.

1. "PITTĀPURAM.—Sir Walter Elliot publishes (*Ind. Ant.* XII, 34) "a note with a page of illustrations on a number of Buddhist relic-caskets "found in a mound of "large bricks," a *stūpa* in fact, at a place called " "*Timmavaram*" in the Pittāpuram Zemindari. These were discovered in " 1848 by the workmen of the Rāja, who were digging for bricks for a "building in course of construction. Each stone casket contained a crystal "casket, and in each crystal casket was a splinter of some precious stone—" "ruby, emerald, or the like,— a small pearl, a bit of coral, and a piece "of gold leaf. These were all sent to the Madras Central Museum. So "far as I have been able to ascertain, the contents of the caskets have "all disappeared, and of the crystal caskets only two portions remain, "which have been erroneously supposed to have come from Amarāvati. "The stone caskets are still in the Museum."

But where is Timmāvaram? There are *three* Timmāpurams in the Gōdāvāri District. Certainly, it is not the big town of the Yellavaram division. There is a Timmāpuram two miles north of Vīravaram (Peddā puram taluk) and a second Timmāpuram, a zamindari village in the Cocanāda taluk; but no Timmāvaram in the Piṭhāpuram zamindari.* Wherever it is, it would be necessary to excavate the Timmāvaram *Stūpa*.

2. KOḌAVALI.—(Piṭhapuram Division) *Annual Report on South-Indian Epigraphy* for the year ending with 31st March 1923: page 3.

"They also examined in site the Āndhra inscription at Koḍavali, "near Piṭhapuram in the Godavari District belonging to king Vāsisthīputra "Chāḍasāta and took fresh copies of the record for the use of the Govern- "ment Epigraphist. On a thorough examination of the hill on which this "inscription is engraved on a wall, the Government Epigraphist has come

* The village of Timmāpuram in the Piṭhapuram Zamindari, which has been referred to as Timmavaram, by the learned Professor, is the same as the Timmapuram in the Cocanada taluk. Ed.

"to the conclusion that there are ruins of a *stupa* here, which have not hitherto been noticed. The spot appears worthy of excavation and "investigation."

But I think that the Koḍavali *stupa* has been forgotten from 1923 up to now.

3. TĀLLURU. (2 miles West-north-west of Tuni) *Godāvari Gazetteer* page 256 :

"A cave in a hill contains the Image of "Talupulamma". "Perhaps it is a cavern, probably a Buddhist rock-cut temple."

4. TĒTAGUNṬA. (7½ miles South-West of Tuni). *Godavari Gazetteer* page 256 :

"A hill there called the Parnasāla Koṇḍa is supposed to have "been inhabited by the Pāṇḍava brothers. It contains a large cave about "a hundred yards in length and consisting of two compartments." The place must be visited.

5. KOTTAPALLI. (9 miles S. West of Tuni) *Godavari Gazetteer* page 256.

"There is a mound by the road side near the village which is "known as the tomb of one Māla Bucchamma".

Buddha dressed as a monk is perhaps now called a *Māla Woman* (Pañch)

6. NĒLAKŌṬĀ ĀVA.

"It is a small village situated in the Chōḍavaram Division, near "the bank of the Gōḍāvari, facing Polavaram and south of Purushotta-patnam. They said that it existed here a *stupa* with inscriptions.

See : *Report on Epigraphy* G. O., Madras, 6th Sept 1918 page 10 and G. O., Madras, 31st August 1920.

7. TĀLLŪRU. (11 miles North West of Peddāpuram) 2 miles West of Jaggampēta. There is a mound now known as *Lingala dibba* (Mound of Phallic Stones) See Sewell lists vol. I page 23 and *Godavari Gazetteer* page 225)

The name seems to be "*Lañja dibba*" and where is mound the mound is perhaps a *stupa*.

8. PEDDĀPURAM.—(Head-quarters of the taluk) From *Gōḍāvari Gazetteer*, page 224.

"A hill in the neighbourhood called the *Fāṇḍavulumetta*. (The "Pandavas' hill") contains a cave which is supposed to be the mouth of an "underground passage leading to Rajahmundry. It is popularly supposed "that the Pāṇḍavas used to haunt this hillock."

9. KÖRUKONDA.—*J.A.H.S.* vol. III. p. 2, 3 and 4 page 88.
From Mr. Bhavaraj V. Krishnarao.

"A path from the caves leads us to the summit of the hill where
"there are remains of a big chaitya built of brick. This place, too,
"deserves excavation."

There can be found marbles around the base of the stūpa similar
those at Ramireddipalli (see *J.A.H.R.S.* vol. 3, p. 1 p. 58).

10. YARRAMPĀLEM.—*J.A.H.R.S.* vol. III. p. 2, 3 and 4 page 16.
Mr. Bhavaraj V. Krishnarao.

"I shall...try to give a brief and yet a detailed account of the
"antiquities found on the hill for the information of those that are interested
"in general and the Government Archl. Department in particular, so that
"the latter may make further investigations and unearth something really
"important from the point of view of the historian and the archaeologist."

11. KOTTAPALLI (four miles from Gōkavaram) Mr. Bhavaraj
V. Krishnarao *J.A.H.R.S.*, Vol. III. Parts. 2, 3, & 4, page 88.

"I did not go and see Kottapalli monastery, where I am told
"there are small figures and statues as well as some paintings. Until I
"see them I cannot say whether my information is true".

12. GANGAMPĀLEM (24 mile north by west of Peddāpuram).
Peddapuram Taluk Sewell *List of Antiquities* vol I page 22.

"A village amongst the hills (Gungummapālem) there is a cave
"temple here said to contain an image of Virabhadra. Near it is a
"maṇḍapam and a well. Beyond this I have no particulars."

A village named Gangampālem is situated only 20 miles North-
West of Peddāpuram and in the Rajahmundry Taluk. It is between
Yerrampālem and Kottapalle (3½ miles N. E. of Yerrampalem and 5 miles
South of Kottapalle) perhaps the hill near Gangampalem with a cave and
Virabhadra image is same as the Kottapalli monastery with small figures
and statues as well as some paintings. Perhaps they are in two different
places and we can expect Buddhist antiquities at Gangampālem and
Kottapalli.

13. JADDANGI (28 miles north of Peddāpuram (Zuddengy),
now in Yellavaram division. Sewell: *List of Antiquities* Vol I page 23.

"On a hill to the West of the village is a cave temple containing
"a lingam. It is just possible that this may prove to be a Buddhist
"chaitya."

Mr. Sewell thought that the "lingam" here was similar the
"tngam" at Gunṭapalli; in fact a small stūpa (a *dagoba*) in a rock-
cut *vihāra*.

Godāvari District Gazetteer (Madras 1915) page 287.

"Near the village is a cave containing the image of the well-known Brahman Saint Māṇḍavya Mahāmuni who is supposed by the local people to have lived in the cave."

But it is probably a statue of Sākyamuni (Buddha).

14. VIRABHADRAPURAM (5 miles South East of Jaddangi).
Godāvari District Gazetteer (Madras 1915) page 288.

"On the Dēvuḍu Pinjāri hill close by is a small cave in which is an idol called Virabhadrasvāmi. This is worshipped every *Sivarātri* by the neighbouring hill people".

It is perhaps a natural cavern with a hindu idol but also it is perhaps a Buddhist rock cut cave.

15. RĀMAVARAM (Seven miles North-West of Addatigela).
Yellavaram division. *Godāvari District Gazetteer* (Madras 1915) page 287.

"On a hill near this village is a small cave in which are four idols".

Probably a natural cavern with rude idols. However the place must be visited.

CONCLUSION: The object of the present paper is to stimulate the archaeological researches in the Godavari District.

SCOPE OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCHES IN THE AGENCY DIVISION OF THE ANDHRA DISTRICTS.

3. THE YĀNĀDIS*.

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

In my papers presented to the *Third* and the *Fifth* ALL INDIA ORIENTAL CONFERENCES, I described the life and habits of the Kōyas and Chenchus respectively. It shall be my privilege now to present this paper on the Yānādis for the *Sixth* ALL INDIA ORIENTAL CONFERENCE.

Physical Features and Measurements.

Like the Khōṇḍs, Kōyās and Chenchus, the Yānādis belong to the *Leotrichi* or smooth haired peoples and to the black strata, and possess the following bodily features:—dark skin, black curly hair, long, and prognathous skull, broad and concave nose, well-developed brow ridges, bony frame with narrow chest and short stature. They are clearly a Pre-Dravidian aboriginal race, which is not thriving well on account of the adverse and unnatural conditions amidst which it is living. They are mainly a jungle tribe, generally choosing, on account of their thieving tendencies, to live on the border-land of the plain regions.

The measurements of three Yānādi skulls obtained by Mr. Thurston are as follows†:—

Three skulls.

Horizontal circumference	46.8	46	47
Length.	16.9	17	17
Breadth.	11.9	12.5	12.8
Cephalic index.	70.4	73.5	72.3
Nasal height.	4.9	3.7	4.4
Nasal breadth.	2.3	2.1	2.5
Nasal index.	47	57	57

2 Meaning of the term "Yanadi."

It would appear that the term is really 'anādi' which means "having no beginning" or, "immemorial". The tribe is really ab-original.

* A paper accepted by the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference held at Patna in December, 1930.

† Vide *Madras Government Museum Bulletin* volume IV, No. 2, page 91.

Another meaning which is equally proper is "having wandering means". The tribe is really nomadic being addicted to hunting and thieving. Another meaning is derived from "*yānā lam*", meaning "living by the boat". The typical Yānādis are found at Śrīharikōṭa, a sea-coast island in Nellore District and some consider that they are immigrants from Straits and Australia. Their ethnic features also resemble those of the inhabitants of Australia. It is more probable that the Australians were themselves emigrants from the East Indian coast. Some define it as *Enāthi*, meaning "a low Jungle or forest tribe". They are the aborigines of the Telugu forest and hilly regions, and the strongest proof in support of this is found in their speaking a vulgar dialect of Telugu. Yānādi may thus be a corrupt form of the Sanskrit word *Anāli*, which means "having no beginning". The Sanskrit speaking Aryans might have given the name *anāṭulu* to those primitive aborigines, who, by vulgar usage, came to be called *Yānādulu*.

3. Yanadi Settlements : Total Population and Distribution.

They are found all along the Telugu-speaking coast from Chingleput to Ganjām, and number over a lac and one third of people, more than half of whom live in Nellore District. The typical Yānādi is to be found still in Śrīharikōṭa, Nellore District. Yānādi settlements also flourish at Pōlavaram, Peddāpuram and Raṁpa in Gōdavari District and here they are called Nakkalas. Their own account is that they lived originally near Pulicat lake but were enslaved by Reḍḍi Rājas who ruled over the Telugu Districts in the 14th and 15th centuries. They also claim to be one with the Chenchus in origin and allude to the worship of the common Chenchu *Dēvuḍu*, but otherwise they do neither inter-mingle with them nor observe their social customs. They are far below them in culture and habits. While the Chenchus worship Ahōbila Narasimha, the Yānādis worship the Pre-Dravidian gods like Pōlēramma, Ankamma and Dravidian gods like Subrahmaṇya and Venkateswarlu. The Reḍḍi Yānādis who are found in Gunṭūr and Nellore Districts are supposed to be of Chenchu clan who fled from Nallamalai hills to the east coast and are regarded as the superior class among Yānādis.

The *Madras Census Report* for 1921 Part I, p. 157 gives the following table of Yānādi population:—

	Population,		
	1921.	1911.	1901.
Yānādi	1,38,426.	1,21,549	1,03,906

The Percentage of increase during this decade, is 13.9 and during 1901 to 1921, it increased by 33%.

Territorial Distribution.

The territorial distribution of the population is thus given in Part 2, page 123 :—

		Males,	Females,
Agency	...	2,865	3,214
Ganjam	...	1,601	2,018
Kistna	...	4,204	4,710
Guntūr	...	9,027	8,857
Nellore	...	40,465	38,354
Cuddāpah	...	2,282	2,173
Chittoor	...	5,724	5,475
Chengleput	...	2,418	2,204

Subdivisions among Yanadis.

At the census of 1921, the Yānādis returned 56 occupational subdivisions of which the Redḍi or Chenchu Yānādis and the *Manchi* or good Yānādis are the main ones. The subdivisions seem to have arisen on occupational or professional basis. Thus, the Redḍi Yānādis are employed as cooks or village watchmen or small cultivators. The *Sōmari* Yānādis are idlers and beggars, but in recent times they are employed as scavengers in the several municipalities, on the East Coast. The Aḍavi Yānādis are a forest or jungle clan depending mainly on forest produce and leading a nomadic life. The *Chattla* Yānādis roam about trees and live by collecting and selling honey, roots, herbs and plants. The *Garapa* Yānādis work on dry land and produce a few dry crops. The *Nakkala* Yānādis are found in Gōḍāvari and Vizagapatam Districts and they live by catching and eating jackals just as the Kappala Yānādis live by catching and eating frogs. The *Manchi* or good Yānādis are a superior class akin to Chenchus and they do not mix with *Kappala* or *Nakkala* Yānādis. They live by conducting street dramas and performing *Harikathas* (Divine discourses).

5 Their Social and Economic Conditions.

The Yānādis live in small *gūḍems* or hamlets consisting of 20 to 25 huts. Their huts, made of palm leaf, are small and circular and conical in shape and of 7 feet high, and rest on a central pole. A small hole forms the gateway. A mat, a pot and an iron axe form their chief property. Their cooking, eating and sleeping is done outside the hut only. Their society is super-patriarchal, as members respect the word of the *Pedda-Yānādi* or Headman who can rebuke, fine or even excommunicate defaulters. They have no tribal mark or rank excepting the headship of the *gūḍem*. They give out their *Kulam* or caste as Yānādi and have the sub-sects also but are treated by śūdras as very low and not of their

caste. In caste and rank, they are above the Mālās and Mādigas or the Pariahs or *Panchamas* of the Coastal Districts. In towns like Vizagapatam, Cocanada, Rajahmundry and Nellore, they lead the life of scavengers or fruitsellers or beggars and owing to contact with town life, their society is undergoing a change for better. The males are no longer found with loin-cloth nor females with rags. They have decent dress, and their manners have improved. Their bodily features are changing from black to brown. They are no longer illiterate or idiotic. They are adopting new house names either after villages or individuals instead of the old ones named after articles or animals. But the *Suddha* or pure Yānādis are still superstitious, indolent, simple-minded, ignorant, unclean and vicious. They rarely bathe and are least God-fearing. They are quite primitive and barbarous. They produce fire by friction with 2 sticks of *Konda-ragi*, *aree*, *juvvi*, *tala* and other trees, or with two stones. They spend their time in hunting or fishing and eat raw flesh. They commit house-breaking dacoity or murder. They have neither houses, nor lands, nor families. Hence, they are still in the barbarous stage.

They have house-names (exagamous septs) like *Baṇḍi* (cart), *Chembetti* (hammer), *Chilaka* (parrot), *Ḍoḍḍi* (sheepfold), *Iga* (fly), *Illu* (house), *Katti* (sword), *Koṭṭu* (cow shed), *Mēka* (goat), *Mānika* (measure), *Pānu* (snake), *Ṭṇkāya* (cocoanut), *Tōṭu* (garden), *Uḍumu* (big lizard), *Jandā* (flag), *Elugu* (bear), etc.

Food, Dress and Occupation.

Their staple food consists of raw flesh of wild animals like deer and boar and mild animals like hare, tortoise, bandicoot, and fish, fruits; roots; nuts; honey etc. They are very fond of collecting forest produce and males and females alike leave their huts alone or in charge of their children in the morning and go to the neighbouring forest or hill with a basket, a long stick, an iron axe or spear, and collect honey, wax, sarasaparilla, tooth sticks (*barrinki*), Nuxvomica, Tamarind, Soapnut, fruits and nuts, skins and horns, and return by evening to sell the same in the bazaars and buy rice and other necessities with the proceeds. Generally, being fond of drink, they spend the proceeds immediately in the toddy and meat shop. The same programme is repeated day after day. They are naturally villainous and their thieving tendency leads to crime at nights on the high roads or in the neighbouring villages. The Nakkalas are therefore treated as a criminal class under Criminal Tribes Act like the Yarakalas and Dommaras and kept under watch by the police.

While the males wear brass bangles for wrists, the females wear garlands of wax beads, and imitation corals round their necks and glass bangles round their wrists. Brass rings for fingers and ears are also worn. In towns, they are able to lead a settled and economic life and so they

possess brass vessels for carrying water and cooking food. On marriage occasions, they are able to provide a gold *tali*, and new cloths to the bride and a good feast to all the assembled relations.

The Yānādis are generally lazy. But when they are in want of food, they work actively. Rope and basket making, fish, hare and tortoise hunting, honey gathering, capturing rats, and bandicoots, collecting forest produce, capturing cobras and wild animals, cutting grass, collecting drift wood, pick-pocketing, practising medicine, committing thefts and dacoities—all these form the chief occupations of the males, while the females work as sweepers or scavengers or fruitsellers and the children graze the cattle of the villagers for a little sum or grain. They are good *shikārīs* and hunt the wild beasts skillfully. They know the forest flora well and knowing the efficiency of particular herbs and roots, they treat successfully fever and rheumatism. They use drugs for cobra bite and their women, in times of confinement, take no other medicine but a decoction of certain leaves. They make faithful servants provided good watch is kept over them.

In the *Madras Census Report*, Part I, page, 221, the following table is given as showing their number, for 1000, engaged in each occupation. In Pp. 254 to 260 in Part II of the report, as many as 56 occupations are named:—

<i>Yānādis.</i>	<i>Number for 1000 engaged in each occupation.</i>	
Labourers	457	
Cultivators	175	
Shepherds	58	
Coolies	44	
Scavengers	23	N.B. The number of female workers very largely preponderates in each case.
Wood cutters	36	
Basket Makers	22	
Rice pounders	21	
Fishermen	31	
Servants	17	
Miner	12	
Village Watchmen	11	
Miscellaneous	93	

Education, Language and Religion.

The Yānādis of Telugu parts speak a corrupt and vulgar form of Telugu with a peculiar intonation and elongation of all vowels. Sometimes one is surprised at the the quickness of expression and shortening of sound. Those who live on the borders of Tamil Districts speak corrupt

Tamil mixed with Telugu. In committing crime, they use strange signs and sounds, the meanings of which are known only to themselves.

They are mainly Hindu but their faith in God is faint. Nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ of their total population are returned as Animists in the census of 1921. Every Yānādi has a *Dēvara Illu* or house of God. They worship *Chenchu Dēvuḍu* as a household God and Pōlēramma or Ankamma or Subbarāyuḍu or Venkatēśwarlu as a Deity ruling the destinies of the whole tribe. Wooden, stone or clay idols, water pots, trees or queerly drawn pictures on walls, represent their Gods. Their worship is simple and they are their own priests. They worship with *Kunkuma* (red powder) and Turmeric (yellow powder) the Gods and they sacrifice fowl to propitiate Gods and to invoke their help in their depredations. On marriage, death, or other special occasions, they sacrifice goats and perform crude ceremonies and indulge in feasting and dancing.

Every *gndem* or hamlet has a soothsayer or prophet who pretends to be in communication with some God or Goddess. Yānādis who lose their belongings or who ail from diseases consult the prophet by offering rice and cocoanuts and by burning camphor or incense before him. Then he becomes possessed and is coated with turmeric and *Kunkuma*, and holding a burning wick in his hand, he chants in praise of the deity and predicts, in a sing-song manner, the cause of trouble and prescribes proper propitiation to the God or Goddess.

The Yānādis observe omens, when they set out for crime, the sight of snake or cat being an evil omen. They observe Dasara and Pongal, the two chief Hindu festivals and drink excessively and indulge in merry dancing in which males beat the drums and females dance and sing vulgar ballads. The Nakkalas also dance on festive occasions in a rude manner singing indecent songs. But the Yānādis of Nellore are more educated as they enact street dramas and sing well. In recent years, they have trained themselves up to the stage. From Cuddapah and Nellore, theatrical companies and parties of Bhagavathulu come out occasionally to collect money.

Regarding their education, language and religion, the following figures are given in the *Madras Census Report* for 1921, Parts I & II.

Madras Census Report Part I.

P. 58.

Percentage returned as animists.

1921	1911
46.8	64.7

Out of $\frac{1}{3}$ lacs, 64,000 are
returned as Animists. p. 236.

Madras Census Report Part II.

Pp. 78 and 107.

Education & Language.

Males.	Females.
70,228	68,198

(851 literate) (173 literate)
66,598 speak Telugu. 66,792 speak Telugu.

The rest speak Tamil or mixed Telugu and Tamil.

Marriage, Birth and Death Ceremonies.

Adivi or forest Yānādis on account of their primitive and barbarous life practise marriage by consent or by force, as the case may be. There is no ceremony among them. But the Redḍi and *Manchi* Yānādis who are leading a settled life and are somewhat cultured, indulge in formal marriage ceremonies. Generally, the parents leave the matter to the concerned couple. Post puberty marriages are the rule. Formerly, a simple betrothal ceremony at the bridegrooms' house finished the business but now a fuller ceremony has taken place. The bride groom presents *voli* or *Kanyasulkam* or brideprice to the maternal uncle of the bride and new cloths to the parents of the bride. A marriage pandal is raised and relations are invited. The bride and groom bathe and put on new cloths dipped in Turmeric water. The *Kankinam* of mango leaf tied to a thread, is tied to the wrists of the parties by the maternal uncle, who acts as the priest. Then the bridegroom in the presence of all relatives ties *tāli* a small gold piece attached to thread round the neck of the bride to the accompaniment of the beat of drum and pipe. After *tāli*, the pair pour rice over each other's heads. It is called *Talambrā'u*. The distribution of *pān supāri* among relations, a feast and a dance close the ceremony. The parties then leave for honeymoon.

The state of conjugal fidelity among the Yānādis is low; adultery is a common vice among males and females. Pregnancy before marriage is not considered a serious matter. Widows can remarry but not with *Tāli* ceremony. Polyandry is not found but polygamy is common. Desertion by either party leads to divorce which is obtained by informing the *Kula Pedda* or Headman. The party that wrongfully deserts has to pay fine to the aggrieved party. The deserted wife is allowed to keep her children, even when she marries another husband. Illegal intimacy with persons of other than Yānādi caste is punished with fine or excommunication by the village head, Yānādis never resorting to courts of law.

There is no *puruḍu* or birth pollution at child-birth. The woman after confinement is given decoction of certain leaves and herbs for three days and then rice diet. On the 10th day, she bathes. A net is hung in front of the door to keep out evil spirits. The child after one month or more is named with the soothsayer's consent after an article or an ancestor. Appigāḍu, Durgāḍu, Akkigāḍu, Mācharigāḍu, are some of the names of the Nakkalas.

The Yānādis bury their dead and Hindu funeral rites are observed. The corpse is laid on leaves and washed. Parched rice is thrown on it by *sapindas*, (agnates) and then it is carried on a bier to the grave. The heads of families attend the burial and place three handfuls of earth into the burial pit and return after the burial and purify themselves first by ordinary

bath and then by sprinkling ash or turmeric water. People of the same *gotra* or *sapindas* drink a handful of water. On the 2nd or 3rd day after burial they perform *Chinnadinam* or Small ceremony Day, when they go to the burial place and sprinkle milk, rice and water on it just as they do on the day of burial itself.

The *Peddadinam* or Big ceremony Day is performed generally on the tenth day. The son cooks rice in a new pot. A clay image, to represent the departed relative, is made and kept in front of the hut and the rice balls are spread in front of it. Then the image and rice balls are taken to a pond or tank where the assembled relations offer prayers to the same and finally they are thrown into it. They then bathe and sprinkle turmeric water and return home, when a feast is arranged for all relations. As usual, music supplied by the pipe and drum and a dance close the ceremony.

Conclusion.

As seen from the *Madras Censuses Reports*, the population figures for 1901 to 1921 give a steady increase showing that the tribe is increasing. All the same, it is very backward and primitive and a few large subdivisions like the *Adivi* Yānādis are classified as criminal tribes and watched by police. They have not parted the stage of primitive or stone age. Also, owing to the promiscuous life led by them, death rate is high and they do not live long. The Yānādi is ignorant, foolish and vicious and his pitiable and neglected condition must evoke sympathy. His position must be improved by Government by starting reclamation works and reformatory schools. The children should be clothed, fed and educated while the adults must be provided work in reserve forests or in Government lands. They may be provided with money and tools of cultivation so that they may become a peaceful agricultural community. The settlement of Yānādis at Bapatla (Stuartpuram) under the Salvation Army and their education by C. B. Mission has to some extent improved their condition and the experiment should be tried on a larger scale by the Government, considering that it is such tribes which are really depressed and oppressed that should be protected from total extinction.

STUDIES IN VIJAYANAGAR POLITY.

K. ISVAR DUTT, B.A.

Chapter XI.

VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION.

A study of South Indian Polity is incomplete without a sketch of the village administration. That the whole of Southern India, especially the portion comprised by the modern Madras Presidency and the South Indian states of Mysore and Travancore, was a net work of tiny village republics, till a few centuries ago, is an admitted fact both by the Indian and the foreign Historians. They survived dynasties after dynasties and succeeded revolutions after revolutions. The various epigraphs published so far bear an eloquent testimony to the above fact.

A few inscriptions of the period under study, relating to the present subject, are found, but it can be fairly presumed, that the village republics which flourished during the Chōla and to Chālukyan epochs flourished also under the Vijayanagar Empire. But the strong centralised Government under this Empire did not foster the growth of these village states ; and yet we find evidence of their existence and their functions.

Each village or group of villages, was administred by a village assembly elected by the villagers. The assembly consisted of various committees with powers to dispose of matters relating to the particular branch of administration entrusted to the same. The committees were subordinate to the assembly and had to carry out its orders.

Some Fundamental Functions of the Village Assembly.

From the various inscriptions extant, we set forth below some important functions exercised by those corporate bodies and elucidate each function with records so far available.

(A) These corporate bodies possessed absolute control over the property vested in its hands and hence sell or acquire land for any purpose, whether of charitable or of public utility. For the benefit of the readers who may be pessimistic about the existence of these village assemblies in days of old, we may mention some instances where their existence has been brought to light. An unfinished record of the Vijayanagar king Harihara II. in Śaka 1310, mentions the assembly of Sevaikulam,

Two inscriptions Nos. 217 and 370 of 1917 of Bukka II, cated in Śaka 1327 and 1328 respectively. From the former we learn that the assembly of Tiruvāndārkōyil consisted of 4,000 members, which was, indeed, a very unwieldy body for transacting business.¹

An inscription of Mallikārjuna Dēva Mahārāja in Ś. 1381 records a gift for the merit of Narasingarāja Uḍaiyar and incidentally mentions the great assembly (*Mahāsabha*) of Kavirippākkam.² So on we can multiply instances of their mention and the various instances that are quoted below, in substantiating their powers and functions, will all tend to prove our statement. No. 350 of 1923 of the time of Harihara II, registers the purchase of certain villages by one Śrīrāma Bhaṭṭa from the Assembly of Ukkal *alias* Vikramābharanachchatruvēdimangalaṁ in in Pāgur-nāḍu for 400 panams. No. 358 of 1903, during the time of the same monarch, records a sale of a village for 400 panams to certain individual by the same assembly. So also 359 of 1923, of the time of the same emperor registers the purchase of a 1/3 share of a certain village by one Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa from the same Assembly for 200 panams.³ An inscription of the time of Virūpākṣa I. records a grant as Tirunāmattukāni to the temple by the village assembly of Tiruppārundurai, of land confiscated by them from a certain Āndānpillai of Tirupattūr, on account of some fault committed by the latter. This is one of instances of the power wielded by the assemblies of that period.⁴ An inscription to the east of Sahalli, Malvilli Taluk, which seems to bear the date S. 1452, informs us that all the *Mahājanas* of Gavudugare granted certain lands as a tax free Kōḍge to Kalā-Nāyaka for having made Saveyahalli, a pura.⁵ An inscription of Prātāpa Devarāya records an agreement among the villagers of Māngāḍu, prohibiting the sale of lands to outsiders or even a gift of them as a dowry, and "this record affords an unique example of the attempt at the preservation of the corporate unity of the village."⁶ One inscription of the time of Achyutarāya, records a gift to the shrines of Pāpayināśadēva, Raghunāthadēva, and Virēśvaradēva, by the *mahājanas* of Nagaragere *alias* Krishnarāyaṇa-Saṇdra-agrahāra, a village in Roḍḍanāḍu. Another inscription of the same emperor records the sale of a land to the above shrines by the *mahājanas* of the *Sarvamānya Agrahāra* village Kāñchīsamudra, which was given to them as a free gift by Pratāpa Dēvaraya.⁷ A record dated S. 1302 registers

1 Para 67 of *Epigraphical Report* for 1918

2 No. 13 of North Arcot District (*Madras Inscriptions* ...)

3 Para 40 of *Epigraphical Report* for 1924

4 Para 35 of *Epigraphical Report* for 1925—26

5 Page 42 *Mysore Epigraphical Report* for 1920

6 No 779 Chingulput District (*Madras Inscriptions*)

7 Nos. 76 and 77 of Anantapur District (*Madras Inscriptions*)

the grant of some land in the village Maddūr, otherwise called Upēndrapura, and the toll collections of the village for the services of feeding pilgrims, recitation of *Vēdas* etc. in the temple of Dēśinātha, by the *mahājanās* and *Gauḍa prajegal*) of Maddūr.⁸

(B) That these assemblies possessed certain inherent rights of fresh taxation, determining the taxes payable to the paramount authority, is elucidated by certain epigraphs that are available. No. 178 of 1926, registers the decision of the assembly of Sirurayal excluding *Sarvamānya* land belonging to a certain deity and to include others for purposes of taxation. No. 59 of 1914, belonging to the period of Vīrapratāpa Dēvarāya registers an agreement entered by the assembly of Parāntakanāḍu and the Valangai 91 and Idangai 98 sects regarding payment of dues to the *Rājāgāram* of the King. No. 384 of 1914 the same year records the gift of right of levying certain taxes to a goldsmith, by the people of Kulai-Kulattūr.

(C) These republics exercised the functions of a trustee which accepted the management of charitable endowments by any private persons and accepted deposits both in kind and coin, or in the shape of landed property for administering the trust on the interest derived from the deposit. Ep. Colln. No. 469 of 1925, of the time of Bukkarāya, records an agreement by the assembly of Nandikampha-chaturvēdimangalam, to feed certain ascetics daily in return for a grant of 400 *kūli* of tax-free land, made as *dānapuram* by a lady named Umaiyal-Ammaiyal. No. 470 of the same year registers a similar agreement by the same assembly with a certain Vanākkani Ponnali Nambi, a merchant of Mirpadi, who endowed as *dānapuram*, 2,000 *kūli* of land in the village Vaippur for feeding daily a specified number of persons versed in *Vēdas*.

(D) The assemblies, exercised certain judicial functions ; one of such is narrated from an interesting epigraph available. A dispute arose between two priests and the managers of the temple of Kāmēśvara-Uḍaiyanāyanār at Aṅgalūr, about the privilege of worshipping the God all the thirty days. The case is succinctly stated as follows:— *A* has been enjoying for a long time the privilege of worshipping the God all the thirty days of the month in the temple, while actually only 15 days belonged to him by right and the remaining to *B* who abandoned the worship and left it unclaimed. ' ' sold $7\frac{1}{2}$ days of privilege of worship, out of the 15 days of privilege of worship to '*B*' of another priest '*C*' and gave him a sale deed. The sale deed so executed, now deprived '*A*' of the acquired right enjoyed by him for some generations back. '*A*' became issueless and the '*Nattār*' volunteered to settle the question of enjoyment,

and during the period of settlement of the question, the worship of the temple was performed by an outsider. Then 'A' appealed to Tirumala Nāyaka, the ruler of the District. He, and the Naṭṭār, together advised the parties to put the case before the *mahājanas* of the *Agrahāra*s of Kulattūr and Alambalam etc. The *mahājanas* assembled together and heard the case from both sides and delivered the following judgment. 'A' may have been the hereditary holder of only of 15 days of privilege and it was not fair to sell part of the disputed portion thereof to an outsider 'C', while the right to purchase in virtue of long enjoyment primarily rested in 'A'. So A must continue to enjoy the full 30 days as before and sale deed given to 'C' should be cancelled.⁹ The above instance, demonstrates the democratic spirit, in which such disputes were settled in days gone by.

(E) Instances there were, that certain private institutions like these fostered the growth of handicrafts also.¹⁰

Merchant Guilds.

Even then the paramount power, or the high officials of the state, never interfered into the rights of these assemblies and could not remit taxes, or make gifts of them, without consent of these bodies, which represented the general will of the people and which jealously guarded the interests of the local people and the Communities. Ep. Colln. No. 681 of 1923 records that Abbarāja Timmappa, the agent of the *Pradhāna Tirumalarāya*, granted the *mālavīsa* of certain villages for the offering of the god Tiruvēngalanātha with the consent of *Seṭṭi-pradhānas* of the villages and of the *Mahānāḍu*. Again Kampadēva Anna, another officer of Achyutarāya is said to have made gift of some duties on crops and of the fee on marriages to the temple of Gauriśvara, with the consent of *Nānāḍu* merchants.¹¹ We have already noticed the instance of Bēlur inscription recording how Salumule Benja merchants, with various sects dependent on them and all the Holiyas of Vijayanagar and 26 other towns where fairs were established, resolved to pay Muddapa-Danḍanāyaka, certain dues in return for the protection afforded by him.¹² A record of the Vijayanagar king Achyutarāya in S. 1456 mentions a gift of tolls collected by the merchants at the market held every Sunday in the hamlet of Vīreśvara-Dēvapura belonging to Lēpākshi, of tolls raised in Harunādu and Hosūra Nādu and of other income, for oblations to be offered at the instance of Vīraṇanāyaka.

9 Para 26 of *Epigraphical Report for 1914*

10 Para 40 of *Epigraphical Report for 1924*

11 Para 83 of the *Madras Epigraphical Report for 1923*

12 *Ep. Carn.* vol. V part I BL 75

When Vira Vijaya Maharāyar son Dēvarāya was on throne, the *Sālumūle* of the 56 countries, with all the cultivators, and Pāñchālas, having assembled, established a weekly fair. In connection with it, which is a *mānya*, for the Paṭṭaṇa-svāmi of the fair Chiyi-Bassi-Chetti, they granted him a land.¹³

A record of Ś. 1447 which falls into the reign of Śrī Krishṇa Dēvarāya, supplies the interesting information that a certain Chennamma Nāyanigār settled three parts of land under a tank at Kaṇḍlakunṭa be set apart for *Velamas*, Gods, and the *Brahmins* and two for *Kāpus* who guarded the country. This affords some indication of the system of village autonomy which was in force in Vijayanagar times. The cultivating classes exercised certain rights along with the Brahmins and the gods.¹⁴

Thus we find that village republics existed and exercised certain functions, preserving the democratic spirit in the medieval South Indian Polity and administration of the temple.

Chapter XII.

TEMPLE ADMINISTRATION.

One important branch of local Self Government in the mediaeval South Indian Polity is its Temple administration. The temple in the South is the pageant of the South Indian monarch's patronage of learning and monuments of his munificence. It is the emblem of the excellent workmanship of the South Indian architect and a conspicuous sign of the South Indian culture. To crown all, it is the epitome of the aesthetic mentality of the monarch. Innumerable inscriptions that have been so far published throw a flood of light on the administration of these temples. These temples were august administrative institutions in themselves and managed by committees or priests, or agents probably elected by the villagers or appointed by them or by the state. The subject is generally dealt with under the following heads.

I. Royal Patronage

- a. Construction and maintenance of temples. Religious neutrality.
- b. Grant of villages and lands to the temples
- c. Making over taxes due to the state, to the temples.
- d. Remitting of taxes on lands gifted away to the temple.
- e. Interference in the temple affairs.

II. Public Patronage.

- a. Construction and maintenance of temples.
- b. Imposition of taxes, for festivals and construction or gōpurams.

¹³ *Ep. Carn.* vol. X BP 72

¹⁴ Para 65 of the *Epigraphical Report 1916*

III. Control.

- a. Management by the village assembly.
- b. Management by the committee of trustees.
- c. Management by priests.
- d. Management by agents.

IV. Finance.

- a. Purchase and sale of lands.
- b. Receipts and disbursements.
- c. Trust properties.
- d. Investments.
- e. Keeping of accounts.
- f. Temple Treasury.

V. Temple Servants and Miscellaneous.

- a. Their colonisation.
- b. The settlement of disputes.
- c. Dancing girls.
- d. Religion and art.
- e. Record of ancient Indian History.

I. Royal Patronage.

The numerous temples that now adorn the South Indian landscape owe their existence to the munificence of its monarchs. To whatever faith they belonged, they constructed temples to the Gods of the other faiths also. The selection of sites for these shrines, shows also their aesthetic bent of mind. In either on the bank of a sacred river, or in the midst of a valley or on the peak of a mountain or in the heart of a populous and religious centre of pilgrimage. The Vijayanagar monarchs of the first Dynasty constructed Vaishnava and Saiva temples and built Jaina shrines also; for the history of Jainism in the Kanarese Province dates back to the Kadamba and the Western Chālukyan times. The Kadamba kings were supporters of the faith and the Western Chālukyan monarchs patronised the same creed. Though the founders of the Vijayanagar Empire imbibed the philosophical expositions of the *Advaitic* monism of the sage Vidyāranya, they were also influenced by the Jaina faith. Jaina temples were built in the heart of the city and ministers like Baichappa, Irugappa, who were the followers of the Jaina creed, were the ministers and generals of army under Bukka and his successors. The family God of the Vijayanagar monarchs is Virūpāksha, the great Śiva who dwells in the famous temple of that name in the capital. The last ruler of the first dynasty forsook Saivism and became an ardent Vaishnava and his subjects also followed the same faith according to "*Prapannāmṛtam*." The monarchs of the *second*, *third* and the *fourth* dynasties were all fervent *Vaishnavas*, but they never forgot their tutelary God Virūpāksha.

Emperor Krishṇarāya built both Siva and Vaishṇava temples. After the first Kalinga Expedition, the king restored, and repaired the damage and carried out extensions to the Vaishṇava temples at Ahōbilam, Tirupati etc., and Śiva temples at Kālahastī, Śrīsailam, Tiruvannāmalai and Chidambaram.

Not only did they spend their fabulous wealth on the construction, extension and upkeep of these glorious shrines, but they granted villages and lands for their maintenance. The grants were registered for the religious merit of their parents, for the glory of their ministers, to commemorate their victories, for the celebration of certain festivities connected with the temple at the time of their coronation, and on some other important occasions.

The benefactions, thus made, may be divided into two broad classes (1) *Devādāna* lands and (2) *Devālāyu* lands. The former were lands held by the temple and the latter were lands granted for the support of the temple. These lands were not exempted from taxation and the authorities who managed them had to pay the *Rajājāram* the annual taxes due to the royal exchequer. But there were occasions also when the monarch made over taxes due to the state, to the temple. Dēvarāya I. issued a '*Nir pa*' or order to Śrīgirimatha of Chandragiri asking him to remit the *Jodi* of 13¼ *poṇ* and 6¼ *panam* or 13, 16¼ *panam*, at 10 *panams* per *poṇ* due to the Chandragirirājya from Tiruppukkuli, in order that that amount may be utilised for the temple of Porēṇṇupperumāl of that place. The order further requests the viceroy to send his own. *Tiruvahichchittu* to the '*Sthānikas* of the village to make copies of king's order¹

Mallikārjuna is stated to have granted to the Nityēśvara Siva temple as Srimūshṇam the taxes amounting to 20 *panam* collected from the Kaikkōlas living in the Tirumaḍavilagam of that temple, in order to conduct service in that temple called Rāhuttamindan-Sandi.² An interesting epigraph of Kampana II. registers the grant of Madambākkam to the temple of Sirrein-Aluḍaiya Nayanar. The charter issued under the orders of the king, by a certain Viṭṭappar runs "This village, the whole villages which is the sacred holding of God, limited by its four boundaries, including the village waste, wet lands, and garden lands with all its limitations of communal obligations, fees on cotton looms, obligations for maintaining oil mills etc., fees for maintaing village servants and other similar obligations, new or old, which may hereafter become due from each tenant, we have given for worship, and repairs as *Sarvamānya* grant to this temple in order that it may last till the Sun and Moon exist". The

1 Para 60 of Epigraphical Report for 1916

2 Para 61 of Epigraphical Report for 1916

limitations imposed by the charter are many, and signify that although the donee—in this case the temple—was exempted from all assessments payable to the established government, was still bound to obey certain rules of internal management and communal obligations.³ An inscription in Chennakesavasvāmi temple in Santarāvūru registers that Sāluva Telungarāyadēva-mahārāya declared tax free the lands owned by Gods and Brahmins of Rāvūru for the merit of himself and his parents.⁴ An inscription at Sedamangalam in South Arcot District informs us that in A.D. 1517 Krishṇa Rāya remitted a revenue of 10,000 gold pieces in favour of certain Śiva and Viṣṇu temples. In Ep. No. 125 of 1904 is a long list of Śiva and Viṣṇu temples which were benefited by the remission.⁵

The interference of the King was sought for, whenever any maladministration, or oppression from any authority took place. The Tiruvorriyur Inscription of Dēvarāya II: records that the *mahēśvaras* of the temple complained to the king, that the tenants, servants, and other residents of the village owned by the temple, had been much distressed by the imposition of taxes such as *Jōḍi*, *Mugampārvai*, *Angaḥalai*, *Ṣumbaḍam*, and *Viṣe-hādāyam* and also by the lease system introduced by Government officers for adoption the trustees. Thereupon it was ordered by the king that the above taxes together with the *Ariṣi-karan*, gold bull, good cow, *vetṭi* and *Kottāyam*, be hereafter collected by the *mahēśvaras* of the temple, that the lease lands already paid for, be redeemed by money received from the royal treasury.⁶

Another epigraph of the same monarch registers an order of the king to the managers of all temples and temple charities, in the district of Tiruchchirupalli-Usavadi thus:—

“As we have been informed by the *mahēśvaras* and Marudavaṇa-Chchiran that the king's officers in the villages belonging to the temple are unjustly collecting the taxes, Kānnikkai, Araṣuperu, Karaṇkkar-jōḍi, Viṣeṣhādāya, Alamanji etc., representing these to be dues payable to the palace, that the villagers taking upon the mortgage lands they purchased, presented or otherwise owned by the temples, stubbornly refuse to give back those lands to the temples and that in consequence temple tenants have abandoned the villages, causing thereby the stoppage of worship in these temples, we order that the taxes mentioned above, shall no longer be collected, the only payable tax however being Sūlavanippon; that the

³ Para 49 of Epigraphical Report for 1912

⁴ Para 68 of Epigraphical Report for 1916

⁵ Nos. 288 of 1903 and 125 of 1904 of Epigraphical collections and para 23 of Epigraphical Report for 1901

⁶ No. 226 of 1913 of Epigraphical collections

worship shall be conducted in future and that the temple lands shall in no case be let out on a long lease, nor shall this be assigned to any one tax free etc.⁷

A record dated S. 1333 of Virabhūpati Uḍaiyar states that as the residents of Vaḷuḍilambhattūchāvaḍi who had agreed to measure out to the temple of Poṇṇam-balanāthar, one *tuni* and one *paḍakku* of paddy per *mā* of wet land, to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ of *paṇam* per *mā* of dry land give one *Uḷakku* of ghee per *payir* of 20 cows and one *Uḷakku* of oil for every *pilavvu*, had discontinued this supply, the King ordered the revival of it and from the proceeds, instituted in his name, the midday service of God.⁸

Thus innumerable instances may be quoted, whence the monarch interfered in the temple administration, whenever his influence was needed in the discharge of Justice.

Public Patronage.

Apart from the Royal patronage that the *South Indian Temple* enjoyed from time to time, it had its equal share from the public patronage. We come across innumerable epigraphs that instance the statement. An epigraph of the time of Vīra Bukkanna Oḍiyar records the construction of the Mallikāṛjuna temple in Arisekere, by the *Mahājanas* of the village and the grant of some land for services in the temple including wages to the '*Kalukutiga*' by the *Mahājanas* under the orders of *Mahāpradhāna* Basaveya Dannāikar.⁹ One inscription records the grant of some land in the village Maddūr otherwise called Upēndrapura and the toll collections of the village for the services of feeding pilgrims, recitation of Vedas and Purāṇas etc., in the temple of Dēśinātha by the *Mahājanas* and Ganḍu Prajegal of Maddūr.¹⁰ We had already an occasion to notice elsewhere how the people came forward to shoulder burdens of additional taxation, when it was a matter of religious inspiration. A provision had to be made for dancing girls for god Ramanātha and thirty *galyāna* a year had to be raised for the purpose and the brahmins levied this at the rate of one pana per plough on the Śūdras and one pana for the family of labourers for hire and undertook to pay the amount in three instalments.¹¹ Yet another inscription of the time of Krishṇadēvarāya records the visit of his great minister to Terkanāmbi, on which occasion he imposed a contribution of 2 pana for every village and hamlet to provide for the car festival of the god Ālvār.¹² Instances may be multiplied but

7 Para 27 of *Epigraphical Report* for 1904

8 452 B of *Ep. Col.* for 1921-22

9 *Mysore Archaeological Reports* for 1928 No. 4 S' 1221

10 *Ibid* 56 S' 1302

11 *Ep. Carn.* vol IV part 2 GU 32 and 34

12 *Ep. Carn.* vol. IV GU 8

all these tend to show that public patronage equally extended to the temple in those days.

Control.

The next important subject in the administration of the temple is the agency through which it was governed. We can broadly divide the same and state that it was four-fold. It was managed by the village assembly or *Sthānikas* (Trustees) or by the priests. We have instances to show that the administration was also entrusted to agents of the king or the provincial governors. Whatever may be the agency through which the affairs of the temple were administered, we can boldly assert that the administration was conducted very efficiently, in the interests of the god or goddess that inhabited the temple.

Conclusion.

The South Indian Temple was thus a powerful economic and social entity besides being a source of religious inspiration. It was the one institution common both to the ruler and the people enjoying the fullest advantages of their healthy cooperation, for by its very origin the temple was a corporation founded with the full cooperation of the local public and the ruling sovereign and his local subordinates. Royal patronage and popular cooperation took many forms but the most common thing was the giving of villages and of lands for the benefit of the great Hindu Institution and management and control by both of them.

Every temple, generally was under the management of a committee. In cases where there was no committee the village assembly acted as the trustee. The central shrine was in the management of the priests or a committee of priests who were responsible to carry on the obligations relating to the maintenance of worship and other things. Similar to the temple central shrine the temple treasury was in the management of a committee, which possessed administrative powers, like the selling of lands belonging to the temple. (*Ep. Col.* No. 321 of 1921). Whenever there were cases of embezzlements by the temple officers there were commissions appointed by the ruling king or his subordinate for enquiry and proper punishment of the culprits. Above all, the temple in the South India appears to have been treated as a Registry office, but fortunately with greater chances of its records lasting longer time than at the present day. This must have been the spirit under which inscriptions previously engraved on the temple walls, pillars and doorways were scrupulously re-engraved when the structure was rebuilt, under official supervision, (Nos. 486 & 487 of 1921). It is this habit of registration which has behind it a truly business-like and historic instinct, that the modern research student owes so much of his accurate knowledge of the past to, and for which he cannot but feel thankful.

KRISHNADEVARAYA, HIS OFFICERS AND CONTEMPORARIES

K. RAGHAVACHARYULU, M.A., B.L.

In the last article*, I dealt with the importance of *Rāyavāchakamu* in dealing with the campaigns of Krishṇadēvarāya and pointed out that the book is entitled to great weight as compared to the *Chronicles* of Paes and Nuniz and other vernacular sources. *Krishṇarāya vijayamu* of Dhūrjaṭi is based upon *Rāyavāchakamu* and repeats its contents to the minutest detail. *Rāyavāchakamu* was written for Viśvanātha Nāik of Madura (1540 A. D.); it closes with the return of Krishṇarāya from the campaigns in Kalinga.

1 The most important personage in the Vijayanagar History of that time is Sālūva Timmarasu, the great Chancellor, otherwise known as Appāji. History honours him and legendary tradition has woven round him a number of stories in connection with Krishṇadēvarāya though many of them have not stood the test of historical criticism.

Timmarasu was the minister of Vīra Narasiṃharāya, and the 'Busbalrao' of Nuniz. Nuniz further informs us that Vīra Narasiṃharāya in order to obtain the throne for his own son after his death asked Timmarasu to put out the eyes of Krishṇadēvarāya and bring them to him. The minister took the eyes of a she-goat to the dying king and after his death, raised Krishṇadēvarāya to the throne. Krishṇadēvarāya made him his chief minister and Timmarasu continued to hold an important position in the state till the later days of Krishṇadēvarāya. Equally strange is the story adverted to by Nuniz that the favourite minister was suspected of having done away with Tirumalarāya, the son of Krishṇadēvarāya and that the latter imprisoned Timmarasu, his son and brother Gōvindarāja and put out their eyes. That Krishṇadēvarāya had a son named Tirumalarāya by Tirumalāmba is proved by epigraphical evidence² but the story about Timmarasu does not find support elsewhere.

Timmarasu was a favourite of the king. 'He commanded the whole household, and to him all lords acted as towards the king.' (*Paes*). During the reign of Krishṇadēvarāya, he was well advanced in age. The *Virinchipuram Inscription* (A. D. 1496) during the reign of Immaḍi

* See above volume IV pp. 221—226

1. *S. I. Inscriptions* vol IV Nos. 803 & 808 (Saka 1429 & 1431)

2. *Ep. Carnatica* vol IV Magadi Nos. 6 & 82.

Narasimharāya refers to a grant by him.³ He was the Chief Minister of Krishṇadēvaraya and one of the Inscriptions goes so far as to describe him as the very body of his master (*South Indian Inscriptions*, vol. VI. No. 146 — *Sachinva* = *śya dehā-iva*, సచివోన్య దేహ ఇవ)

The great minister was an *Āruvāla Niyōgi* Brahmin of Kaundinya *Gōtra* and was a warrior as well as a great administrator. He followed Krishṇarāya in his campaigns and received the viceroyalty of Koṇḍaviḍu at his hands. Nuniz says that he left his brother Gōvindarāja and proceeded with his master in his Kalinga tour. The minister was personally present at the siege of Rāichur in 1520 A. D. He is said to have defeated one Madar Maliquo near Koṇḍaviḍū (Sewell thinks that the latter was a general of Kutub Shāh of Gōlconḍa) and after settling the country returned to Vijayanagar.

hāyavāchakamu refers to him along with Ayyamarasu, Koṇḍamarasu and Bācharasu. The book further refers to the dissatisfaction of Krishṇarāya during the early years of his reign and Timmarasu reprimanded him for his lack of foresight in leaving the capital at dead of night on a certain occasion and promised him that hence forward the affairs of the kingdom would be run in accordance with his wishes. The book further informs us of the strategem of Timmarasu in creating disunion between the *Sixteen Pātruḍus* and Pratāparudra Gajapati of Kalinga which led to the defeat of the latter and the victory of Krishṇarāya. The commentary on *Frabōlhachandrodāya* of Krishṇamiśra by Nādenḍla Gōpamantri, a nephew of Timmarasu, refers to the latter as a patron of Poets, *Kavi-pārijālah*. The Bezwada Inscription of Singarāja⁴ refers to him in equally eulogistic terms.

అఖిలమపి భువనభారం మూర్తిమతి విశ్వాసనివాసే నిఖిలగుణానామతి
తపనధామ్ని సాశ్వతిమృనామ్ని మంత్రినిపాతివిజితసురమంత్రిని నిధాయ

"akhilam-api bhuvana-bhāraṁ mūrti-mati visvāsa nivāsē nikhila guṇānām-atitapanadhāṁni Sāḷva Timma nāṁni mantriṇi pāti vijita sura mantriṇi nidhāya.

Further, Timmarasu is said to have been the author of a commentary called *Maṇōhara* on the *Bā'abhārata* of Agastya (Refer *Sources of Vijayanagar History* p 143, where the colophon of the work is cited). We also learn that Timmarasu had a *Kāryakarta* (Secretary) called Rentūri Chittamarasu⁵, and his *Upapradhāna* or second minister was Sōmarasu son of Mēlamamantri of Chandragiri.

3. S. I. I. vol I No. 115

4. *Ibid* 789 • (Saka 1440)

5. S. I. I. vol IV No. 702

2 Sāluva Gōvindarāja brother of Timmarasu and son of Rāchirāju. Prior to A. D. 1513, it appears that Gōvindarāja as well as Timmarasu were in enjoyment of Gutti Sīma.⁶ The statement of Nuniz that Timmarasu left his brother Gōvindarāja in charge of Konḍaviḍu is not correct. Gōvindarāja is referred to as the *Nāyak* of Terakanambi *Sīma* in Hoysale *nāḍu* between A. D. 1513--22. An inscription of 1523 A.D. refers to him as a minister of Krishṇadēvarāya⁷. In the battle of Raichur, Gōvindarāja followed Kumāra Vīrayya of Seringapatam as is referred to by Nuniz as 'Ogendraho,' the Governor of the city of Vijayanagar

3 Nādēṇḍīā Gōpamantri was the nephew (sister's son) of the great Minister Timmarasu and the son of Krishṇāmbikā and Timmamantri. He had two brothers Kōna and Appa. The latter married Tirumalāmba, the daughter of Timmarasu and Lakshmāmāmbā, and the work *Rājaśākha Charitam* of Mādayagāri Mallana in Telugu is dedicated to him. He became famous for his benefactions to the poor. Gōpamantri is referred to in *Rājaśākha Charitam* as having been ruling over the kingdom of Gutti but was placed in charge of Konḍaviḍu by his uncle Timmarasu. He was the author of *Krishṇārjunasamvādamu*, a *Dvipadakāvya* in Telugu and a commentary in Sanskrit on the famous *Prabōdhachandrōdaya* of Krishna Miśra. Both the works refer to him as the ruler of Konḍaviḍu. His assistant was one Dēchayāmātya, the author of a commentary on *Mahimnastava* and a pupil of Lakshmīdhara, *Rāyavāchakamu* mentions that after the Siege of Konḍaviḍu, one Konḍayya (Rāyasam Konḍamarasu) was left in charge of the fort. But this seems only to be a temporary arrangement. Konḍamarasu as we shall presently see was in charge of the Udayagiri division. At Konḍaviḍu, Krishṇadēvarāya took Vīrabhadra, the son of Pratāparudra Gajapati, Narahari Pātro son of Kumāra Hammīra Patro, Mallapakhan of Rāchuru, Vuḍḍanda khan, Pūsapati Rāchirāju, Lakshmīpatirāju, Janyāla Kēśavāpātrūdu and Bālachandra Mahapātro of the west as prisoners but seems to have treated them with respect and released them subsequently.⁹

4 Rāyasam Konḍamarasu. He was the son of Śripatirāju Timmaya and Singayamma and seems to have been in charge of Penugonḍa in A.D. 1512.¹⁰ He was put in charge of the Udayagiri Division about A. D. 1515 and continued till A. D. 1525. He was in his old age a minister and *kāryakarta* of Krishṇadēvarāya and is said to have built the two tanks of Anantasāgaram and Kaluvāyi. In the battle of Raichur in

6. *Ibid* vol IV Nos. 800 802 & 803

7. *Ep. Car.* vol IV Ch. 99

8. Recently published in Hyderabad by Mr. S. Pratapa Reddi

9. *Amaravati Inscription*—Saka 1437 S. J. I, vol VI, No. 248.

10. *Ep. Carnatica* vol XII Pg. 5

A. D. 1520 he was one of the generals in the army of Krishṇadēvarāya. Nuniz refers to him as Condemara (Conḍamarāḍe) and says that he was the person consulted by Narasa Nāyak, the father of Krishṇarāya in his attempt to get at the throne of the Sāluvas. He further says that after the alleged dishonour of Timmarasu about A.D. 1527, Krishṇadēvarāya appointed as his chief minister one Ajaboissa (Ajaparca Timmappa) the son of Conḍamarāḍe. As to who is meant by Ajaparca Timmappa, it is not clear. One Timmappa Naik was the *third* in command at the battle of Raichur but it cannot be asserted that he was the son of Konḍamarasu above referred to and the Minister of Krishṇadēvarāya in his later days. Konḍamarasu died about A. D. 1525 and was succeeded by Appapparasayya.¹¹

5 Mallarasu, the son of Nāgarasu is said to be a minister of Krishṇadēvarāya and was in charge of Jajur Sīma in Hoysala Nāḍu.¹² He established a fair in Rāmāgiri and his manager was Vāmarasu.

6 Krishṇarāya Naik—He is described as the right-hand man of Krishṇadēvarāya¹³ and was his agent for affairs or *Kāryakarta* in A.D. 1520.¹⁴ In 1527 A.D., he seems to have become quasi-independent and is endowed with royal titles, *Mahārājadhirāja paramēśvara Mēdinī-mśara gaṇḍa etc.* His son was Mallarasā' (Hy. 78). He belonged to the Sāluva family and Nuniz refers to him as Lord of Aosel and one of the important Nāyaks in the reign of Achyutārāya.

7 Vīrabhadra Gajapati son of Pratāparudra Gajapati of Orissa was placed in charge of Malaya Benur Sīma in Hoysala Nāḍu.¹⁵ The story of Nuniz that he was insulted in public in the city of Vijayanagar and that in consequence, he put himself to death is untrue. Vīrabhadra Gajapati does not however seem to have continued as a Nāyak as one Ādiyappa Naik was put in charge of the above *sīma* about A.D. 1528.

8 Ādiyappa Naik (Ādeppa) was one of the generals at Raichur. He was an officer at the door of Krishṇarāya's palace¹⁷ and his brother Sinnappa Nāyak was connected with the revenue settlement of one of the districts in Krishṇarāya's time.

9 Yellappa Naik was in charge of Ramanayakahalli Sīma in A.D. 1510 (*Ep. Carn.* vol. XII Mg. No. 58)

11. *Ep. Report* 1913—Page 122

12. *Ep. carnatica* vol XI—Holalkerc Nos. 70 73 84 108 & 128

13. *Ep. Car* vol IV Hg 40. 78 & 84

14. *Ep. Car* vol IV Hun 48

15. *Ep. Car.* vol XI Dg 107

16. *Ep. Car* vol XI Dg 106

17. *Ep. Report* 1915—16 Page 143.

10 Māde Naik was in charge of Sōlūr Sīma in A. D. 1515-16 (*Ep Carn.* vol. IX. Magadi No. 68 and vol. XII. Kunigal No. 25)

11 Kanchi Sōmanna Oḍeyar son of Timmanna Oḍeyar was in Chennapaṭṭaṇa Sīma in A.D. 1513.

12 Kampa Oḍeyar is referred to as a minister in A. D. 1518 (*Ep. Corn.* Kankanhalli No. 73. vol. IX.)

13 Singṭpa Naik. He calls himself the *priyakumāra* of Krishṇadēvarāya in A.D. 1528 18.

14 Kumāra Vīrayya of Seringapatam. He is the father-in-law of Krishṇadēvarāya and father of Tirumaladevī (Sewell's *Forgotten Empire* p. 336).

15 Nuniz mentions that one Kāma Naik was the Commander-in-chief of Krishṇaraya at the battle of Raichur and the second in command was Triambakarao. The latter was the son of Tipparasa and ruled the Muḷavāye country during the last days of Krishṇadēvarāya's reign.

The *Epigraphical Reports* further mention that the Sriśaila Rājya was ruled by one Chandraśēkharayya, son-in-law of Dēmarasa, that Sellappar Vīra Narasiṁha Nāyakar son of Taluvakkulaindan Bhaṭṭar was in charge of Chingleput district and that the Vinukonḍa sīma was under *Mahomandalesvara* Alamāndala Sarvayyadēva Chōḍa Mahārāja son of Yeṇṇayyadēva.

It further appears that a military officer by the name of Immaḍi Basavaṇṇa Oḍeyar granted a Village called Dannāyakpura for maintaining a water-trough for animals at Sogē in Bellary District. Even the poet-laureate Allasāni Peddana was the lord of Karivāchi Sīma in South Arcot District.²⁰

The *Rāyavāchakamu* stops its chronicle of events with the Kalinga tour of Krishṇadēvarāya. It mentions the following generals and officers that were present at the coronation of Krishṇadēvarāya. Appāji, Ayyamarusu, Konḍamarusu, Bācharasu, Yellamarasu, Vīramarasu, Yellanna, Apparapillai Mannārpillai, Rāyasam Rāmachandrayya, Bhāskarayya of the Treasury, Avasaram Venkatayya, Triambykayya, Lakshmīpati, Tipparasu and Lingarasu. In the eastern campaign, Konḍayya (Konḍamarusu), was left in Konḍavidu. Bhāskarayya in Vinukonḍa, Vīrabhadrayya in Bellamkonda and Ayyalayya in Nāgārjunakonḍa. One Pemmasani Rāmalinga Naidu distinguished himself in the first campaign against the Mohammedans in A.D. 1512. According to the *Krishnarāya Charitram* he led the Vijayanagar forces to battle on the bank of the Krishna, against the Mohammedans.

18 *Ep Car* vol IX Bangalore No 19 *Ibid* XII Chiknayakanahalli No. 37

19 *Ep Report* 1915—16 p. 142

20 *Ep Report* 1915—16 Page 148

At the coronation of Krishnarāya were also present Āravīti Bukkarāju, Sāluva Mēkarāju, the Śrīpatis, Būḍahāllis, Rachuri Timmaraju, Sangarāju, Velugōṭivarū, the chiefs of Nāndyāla, Owk and others. It is not possible to trace some of the names above referred to. The Kingdom of Vijayanagar, as referred to by Nuniz with reference to the reign of Achyutarāya, was divided into a number of principalities. Bācharusu seems to have been in Achutarāya's time in charge of a portion of the eastern territory conquered from the Gajapatis of Kalinga.²¹

A good deal of controversy centres about the eight poets in Krishnaraya's court called the *Ashtadiggajas*. The *Rāyavāchakamu* mentions three of them, Peddana, Timmana and Mallana. Chaturvēdi Rāmadikshitulu, Krishnāvadhāni, Venkatarāmasāstri, Prabhākaraśāstri were some of the Pandits of Vijayanagar present at the coronation of Krishnadēvaraya. One Chandrayya was his instructor in *Nitiśāstra*. The copper plate inscriptions of the king mention one Sabhāpati as the composer and Viranācharya son of Mallanāchārya as the engraver. The king's Charioteer was Timmā and the city watcher was Jangamayya.

Sabhāpati the author of Krishnadēvarāya's copper plate inscriptions is said to be the maternal uncle of Arunagirinātha, the author of *Sōma-valli Yojā and Prahasanam*. The famous Rājanātha Dīṇḍima, the author of *Sāluvābhyudayam* and *Āchyutarāyābhyudayam* was the son of Arunagirinātha.²²

21 Butter worth & Venugopal Chetti; *Nellore Inscriptions*—Ongole No. 23 (1533—34 A.D.)

22 *Ep. Report* 1922—23.

king, confirmed, in his 5th year,¹³ the village of Pulombūru,¹⁴ which was formerly granted by the Vishnukūṇḍin Mādhavavarma of the Telugu Academy plates, to Rudra Śarma, son of Śiva Śarma and grandson of Dāma Śarma, of Gautama, *gōtra*. In this grant, Rudra Śarma was styled as *Parvāgrahārika*, meaning thereby, one who was in the enjoyment of the *agrāhāra* formerly. In Rudra Śarma's father Śiva Śarma and grandfather Dāma Śarma, we can recognise the donee and his father of the

13. Mr. Subba Rao reads this numerical symbol, as 4 representing the year, in which the grant was made (*Vide* p 76). In the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy for 1913, in the review portion of this grant, the year for which this symbol stands, was given as 15. Both the readings are wrong. This Symbol stands for 5 and not for either 4 or 15. It is curious how Mr. Rangachari omits this portion, concerning the date, entirely; there is mention of the year only and the rest is omitted both in the *Epigraphical Report* and in Mr. Subba Rao's text. The omitted portion, contains numerical symbols, which I read as "gi (grī?) 8 1 di 7 1". According to late Mr. Lakshmanarao 'di' is=100, which I think is wrong.

14. Mr. Subba Rao, in his review of these plates, mentions the village granted as Polamūru in its present form, but not in the form as found in the inscription. But in another place, he mentions it as Pulimbūru; while reading it as Pulibūmra in the text. Mr. Rangachari, in the review proper (on page 255) mentions the name of the village as Pulibūmra, with Pulebūru perhaps as its probable variation in brackets. But curiously enough, in the text of the inscription, he reads it as Pulobūmra and in the translation he gives it as Pulibūmra: so many be wildering, though interesting variations of the same word! In the *Annual Report* on Epigraphy (sic) for the year 1913-1914, in which this grant was reviewed, the name of this village was read as Pulebūmra (Pulebūru). Late Mr. K. Lakshmanarao reads this as Pulumbūru. None of the above readings are correct in my opinion. The correct reading is Pulombūru and not Polumburu or Pulibūmra or Pulibūmra.

The form 'li' may be found in the same grant in 23rd line in 'pālita'. The dot representing the anuswara, which is above 'bu' should go with 'lo' but not with 'bu'. In Ancient Telugu inscriptions the *anusvāra* that should go with the preceeding letter is generally placed above the succeeding letter for this reason. Pulombūru is the ancient Telugu spelling, of Polamūru, with the labial 'm' placed above 'bu'. In the evolution of the Telugu orthography the nasals and labials were gradually dropped and their place was taken first by dots and then by *anusvāras*. So in later days whenever the nasal or labial occurred in conjunction with any letter of its own varga, its place was shown by a dot. Thus the dot over 'bu' in 'Pulombūra' go must be taken to with 'lo'.

Telugu Academy plates of Vishṇukunḍin Mādhavavarma. From this it is clear that after the Vishṇukunḍins, the Chalukyas conquered Vēngi. Late Mr. K. V. Lakshmaṇa Rao discussed this question thoroughly, and fixed the date of the Telugu Academy grant as 594 A.D.,¹⁵ which would be the 48th regnal year of Mādhava varma, the donor of the plates, and came to the conclusion that this Mādhavavarma of the Telugu Academy plates and his son Mañchanna Bhaṭṭāraka were defeated either by Pulakēsin II. or his brother Kabja Vishṇuvardhana I. Thus he gave 610 A. D. as the probable last date of Mādhavavarma III. Taking this as the basis, he fixes approximately the chronology of the kings, mentioned in this grant as follows, allotting 25 years as the the period of rule for each king, unless otherwise known to have ruled for a greater period.

Vikramēndravarma 496—521 A. D.


↓
Gōvindavarma 521—546 A. D.

↓
Mādhavavarma III. 546—610' A. D.

Thus, it is not possible to place Indrabhaṭṭāraka after Vikramēndravarma of the Telugu Academy plates, and Mr. Subba Rao's date for Indrabhaṭṭāraka becomes quite untenable.


Now, there is Vikramēndra varma, son of Indrabhaṭṭāraka (according to the Chikkulḷa plates) and father of Gōvindavarma (according to the Telugu Academy plates.) This Vikramendra varma of both the abovementioned Sets may, therefore, be taken to be one and the same person. If we link the pedigrees in this manner, we have to take Mādhavavarma of the Chikkulḷa plates to be Mādhava varma II of the first set of Ipūru plates. Then the geneology of the Vishṇukunḍins can be arranged as follows :

15. Here is what Mr. Lakshmanarao says about the date of this grant: " The plates give the lunar eclipse on the full moon day of the month of Phālguna as the occasion for the grant (ll. 25-7). In the years 575, 593, 594, 612 and 621 of the Christian era lunar eclipses occur in the month of Phālguna. Of these I reject the first as being too early a date for the 48th year of the reign of a king who must have been defeated by Kubja Vishṇuvardhana or his brother Pulakesin II. I reject the last (621) as being too late a date for a king, who was apparently defeated by Pulakesin at the beginning of the seventh century, about 610 A.D. We know that Kubja Vishṇuvardhana had declared independence about 616 A.D. Of the three remaining dates, it so happens that the lunar eclipses in 593 and 612 were not visible in India, as these occurred at a time when the sun was above the horizon in India. Thus we hit upon 594 as the only possible date on which Madhavavarma could have issued this grant. The 10th day of February 594 A. D. is then in all probability the day on which, this grant was issued".



In accordance with this, we have to reject Mr. Subbarao's geneology of the Vishnukundins as inconsistent.

Even taking the geneology as supplied by him, to be correct his chronology and the starting point of the Gāṅga Era are also faulty. He places Mādhavavarma I. about 400 A.D. Even assuming 400 A.D. to be the closing date of the founder Mādhavavarma I, the date of accession of Indrabhattāraaka varma cannot be 525 A. D. As the copper plate records of the Vishnukundin kings supply 37 years to Mādhavavarma II, 27 years to Indrabhattāraakavarma, and 48 years to Mādhavavarma III. we have to allot to the other kings this same period of reign if not a more instead of 25 years. Then the chronology may be arranged as follows:



Thus Indrabhattāraaka's accession would have taken place in 560 A. D. and not in 524 A. D. As his grant supplies us with his 27th regnal year his period of rule would be from 560 to 587 A. D. or a little more even. If this last mentioned year, as Mr. Subbarao says, roughly corresponds to the 91st year of the Gāṅgāya Era, then its starting year would be 495.

496 A.D or roughly at the closing period of the fifth century, but not during the middle of the fifth century, i.e, 450 A. D. And the starting point of the Gāṅga Era, 495—496 A.D is not correct as it has been arrived at by following the above *wrong* geneology and chronology, and has, therefore, to be set aside. Thus the date of Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty and the starting epoch of the Gāṅga Era, arrived at, by Mr. Subbarao cannot be maintained.

One thing remains and that is about the identification of Indrādhirāja, mentioned in the Gōḍāvari plates of Prithivīmūla. Mr. Subbarao definitely takes him to be no other than Indrarāja alias Rājasimha of the Kaṭṅga Gāṅga dynasty, whose dates are 87 and 91 of the Gāṅga Era. This identification is wrong and cannot stand the test of criticism as we shall presently see.

So far we have only three sets of plates of the Kaṭṅga Gāṅga king Indravarma, with whom Indrādhirāja of the Gōḍāvari plates has been identified. The first set is the Achyutāpuram plates;¹⁶ the second is the Santa bommāli plates¹⁷ and the third is the Parākimeḍi plates,¹⁸ issued in the 87th,¹⁹ and 91st years of the Gāṅga Era respectively. All these three grants give him the title Rājasimha and all these were written by Vinayachandra, son of Bhānuchandra.

There is another grant, written by the same scribe Vinayachandra, having for its date 80 of the Gāṅga Era. This is of Hastivarma,²⁰ the Kaṭṅga Gāṅga king, who also bears the title Rājasimha. From this, it may be concluded that Hastivarma was, as given in the Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1920 (*pag*? 196, *para* 3), perhaps the immediate predecessor of Indravarma alias Rājasimha and might have been also his own father, as is shown in the very same Kaṭṅga Gāṅga geneology (*on page* 163) tentatively formulated by Mr. Subba Rao. When Mr. Subba Rao himself takes this Indravarma of the 87th and 91st years of the Gāṅga Era to be the son of Hastivarma of the 80th year of the Gāṅga Era, I have the least objection to accept his identification. But in such a case, how could this Indrarāja, son of Hastivarma of Kaṭṅganagara, his immediate predecessor, be identified with Indrādhirāja son of Mitavarma of Maṇal-kunḍi of the Gōḍāvari plates? Neither in the earlier nor in the later Kaṭṅga Gāṅga geneologies do we find the name of Mitavarma. The Kaṭṅga grants do not give Mitavarma, even as an alias of Hastivarma. Hence the identification of Indrādhirāja with Indravarma, alias Rājasimha of Kaṭṅga is utterly baseless and untenable.

16 *Ep. Ind.* vol. III p.127 ff. 17 *Ante* vol, IV p, 21 ff.

18 *Ind. Ant.* vol. XVI.p. 181 ff

19 The numerical symbol representing 'Jyeshtha divasa' was misread as 10 by the editor of this grant Sree Lakshminarayan Harichandan Jagadev Raja Bahadur garu. The correct reading is 80.

20 *Ep. Ind.* vol. XVII p. 838 ff *C.P.* No. 3 of 1919—1920 and *Andhrapatrika Annual for 1920*

INDRABHATTARAKA AND THE GĀNGA ERA.

M. SOMASEKHARA ŚARMA.

In this Journal, while editing the Chīḍivalasa plates¹ of Dēvēn-dravarma, Mr. R. Subbarao has discussed at some length about the Kalinga Gāṅga Era. There are some apparent errors in what he has written, which mislead the readers, who do not know the subject, and further those errors pass on as trustworthy facts, not having been corrected up till now. So I propose here to review the whole question of the Gāṅga Era formulated by him.

Mr. Subbarao takes into consideration mainly the Synchronism, afforded by the Godāvari plates² of Prithivīmūla, as the basis of the whole discussion. The particular passage that has got reference to this in that grant, runs as follows:

“शृताभिजनवृत्त सम्पत्प्रभाभासुरोदार पुरुषरत्नानिकर प्रसूतिहेतुप्रख्यात मणल्कु
डि वास्तव्य द्विजात्यन्वयपायोधिसम्भूत शितरश्मे रसकृदवाप्त चतुर्दन्तसंग्रामविज
यस्य मितवर्मणः प्रियतनयेन सरभसामिन्द्रभट्टारक समुत्पादनाभिलाषसमुदित प्रमुदिता
शेष नृपतिकृत तुमुलसमराधिरूढ मुप्रतीकानेकपाभिमुख समदकुमुदद्विरद निपातनाधि
गत भुवनतल वितत विपुल शुद्धयशसा श्रीम दि म्ना धि रा जे न ...”

The veiled figurative expression—that Indrādhirāja, son of Mitavarma, who was the Moon that arose from the ocean of the twice-born family that inhabited the famous town of Maṇalkuḍi, who obtained victory with the four-tusked elephant *Chaturdanta* (of the eastern quarter), who overthrew the elephant *Kumula* (of the south-western quarter), that came against the elephant *Supratika* (of the north-eastern quarter) mounted by him, in the tumultuous combat waged by all kings, that assembled together with the desire to uproot Indrabhṭṭāraka, gives us to understand, as Dr. Fleet says, that Indrādhirāja of the north-eastern quarter, son of Mitavarma, who won in battle the king of the east, fought in company of other chiefs of the country who united to uproot a certain Indrabhṭṭāraka, and conquered the king of the southern quarter (probably the same Indrabhṭṭāraka, mentioned above). Dr. Fleet has taken this

1. *Ante* vol. II p. 146 ff.

2. *J. B. B. R. A. S.* vol. XVI. p 114 ff.

Indrabhaṭṭāraka to be the Eastern Chālukyan Indrabhaṭṭāraka, brother of Jayasimhavallabha I. and son of Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana.³ According to Prof. Dubreuil, he is identical with Indrabhaṭṭāraka, son of Vikramēndravarma, of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty. Mr. Subbarao accepts Prof. Dubreuil's identification. While Dr. Fleet⁴ and Mon. Dubreuil,⁵ with some hesitation, identify Indrādhirāja of the Godāvari grant, with Indravarma alias Rājasimha of the Kalinga Gāṅga dynasty. Mr. Subbarao definitely takes him to be the same person. The whole discussion of Mr. Subba Rao about the Gāṅga Era is based on this synchronism and the date of Indrabhaṭṭāraka varma of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty.

According to Mr. Subbarao the pedigree and the probable Chronology of the Viṣṇukunḍins are as follows:

Mādhava I (*Probably ruled about 400 A. D.*)

↓
Dēvavarma

↓
Mādhavavarma II. (*Donor of Īpūr plates, 1st Set*)

↓
Gōvindavarma

↓
Mādhavavarma III. (*Donor of Īpūr plates, 2nd set; 37th year*)

↓
Vikramēndravarma I.

↓
Indrabhaṭṭāraka or Indravarma (*Donor of Rāmatīrtham plates
27th year; probably ruled from 525 to 555 A.D.*)

↓
Vikramēndravarma II. (*Donor of the Chikkulā plates: 10th year*)

Mr. Subba Rao writes about the date of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarma thus:

"Now taking 400 as the closing date of the founder Mādhava-varma I and granting an average of 25 years as the period of rule for every succeeding king, we get 525 A. D. as the date for the accession of Indrabhaṭṭāraka, the donor of the Rāmatīrtham plates."

As this was the same Indrabhaṭṭāraka, who was defeated by Indrādhirāja (of the north-eastern quarter), whom he identified with Indravarma of the Kalinga Gāṅga dynasty, whose dates are 87 and 91 of the Gāṅgēya Era, Mr. Subbarao is of opinion 'that the Gāṅgēya Era of 91st year, was started during the middle of the 5th century, i. e. 450 or 460 A.D.' He concludes from the above evidence that the Gāṅga Era, therefore, must have begun *about the middle of the fifth century*.

To understand fully the above question some knowledge of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty is essential and we obtain that mainly through

3. *Ind, Ant.* vol. XX. p 97.

4. *Ibid.* vol. XIII. p 119 ff.

5. *Ancient History of the Deccan.* p 91

Copper plate records, which are only five in number, namely, i. Rāmatīrtham plates⁶ of Indrabhattāarakavarma; ii. Chikkulḷa plates⁷ of Vikramēndravarma; iii. Īpūru plates⁸ of Mādhavavarma; iv. Īpūru plates⁹ of Mādhavavarma; and v. The Telugu Academy plates¹⁰ of Mādhavavarma.

The Rāmatīrtham plates give the following genealogy:

Mādhavavarma
|
Vikramēndravarma
|
Indrabhattāarakavarma

These plates record that the last mentioned king granted the village of Pēruvāṭaka in Pḷaki vishaya to a brahman named Nagna Śarma, in his 27th regnal year. As this *vis'aya*, was known in later times as Prakki or Pakkirāshṭra, and formed part of the present Vizagapatam district, Mr. Subbarao thinks that Puraniśaṅgama Vāsaka, from which these plates were issued, might be in the same Vizagapatam district.

Chikkulḷa plates give one generation. According to these the pedigree is as follows:

Mādhavavarma
|
Vikramēndravarma I.
|
Indrabhattāarakavarma
|
Vikramēndravarma II.

The last mentioned king, who issued the from Īṇḍulūru Vāsaka, which was identified with the present Dendulūru, near Ellore, West Godavari district, granted the village Rēgoṇḍa, to the south of Rāvirēnu, on the bank of the river Krishṇa-Benṇa (Krishṇa), to Sōmagiriśvaranātha in the 10th year of his reign.

The First set of Īpūru plates supply three generations of kings, as shown below:

Mādhavavarma I.
|
Dēvavarma
|
Mādhavavarma II.

Mādhavavarma II. issued this grant from Amarapura, in his 37th regnal year. This city has not been yet correctly identified, but the late

6. *Ep. Ind.* vol. XII. p. 133 ff.

7. *Ibid.* vol. IV. p 193 ff.

8. *Ibid.* vol. XVII. p 337 ff; *C.P.* No. 11 of 1919-1920.

9. *Ibid.* vol. XVII. p 334 ff; *C. P.* No. 12 of 1919-20.

10. *Journal of the Department of Letters*, vol. XI. p 31 ff; *C.P.* No. 7 of 1993-1914; *Bhārati* 1930-31.

Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao threw out a doubtful suggestion that this might be Amarāvati in the Gunṭūr district.

The Second set of Ipūru plates supply us with only two generations of kings, as shown below :

Gōvindavarma
|
Mādhavarma

This Mādhavarma grants the that lage of Viṣembali to Agni Śarma of the Vatsa *gotra*, in his 37th regnal year. The executor of the grant was Mañchinna bhattachārka, the son of the donor, Mādhavarma.

Lastly we have the Telugu Academy plates, which yield the following geneolgy.

Vikramēndravarma
|
Gōvindavarma
|
Mādhavarma.

The last mentioned king Mādhavarma granted, in his 48th regnal year, the village of Pulombūru in the Guddavādi *visaya* to Śiva Śarma, son of Dāma Śarma, and grandson of Rudra Śarma, of Gautama *gotra* and a resident of Kuṇḍūra¹¹ in Karmarāshṭra.

Now we have to connect all the pedigrees, supplied by these various plates into one connected geneology. The question now arises : in which order are they to be linked ? As for the pedigrees, supplied by the Rāmatīrtham and Chikkuḷla plates there is no difficulty at all. Similarly there is not much difficulty in linking together the pedigrees, supplied by the second set of Ipūru plates and the Telugu Academy plates. Now there are *four* Mādhavarmas in all (two in the First Set of Ipūru plates and one in each of the Chikkuḷla and the Telugu Academy plates). The question is one of identification. Who is to be identified with whom ? This is not as difficult as it seems to be.

Another synchronism is supplied by the Pulombūru grant¹² of the Eastern Chālukya king Jayasimha vallabha I. a son of Kubja Vishṇu-wardhana I. who ruled from 633 to 666 A. D. This Chalukyan

11. Mr. Subbarao reads this as Kunduka, which is obviously wrong.

12. This grant was edited by Mr. Subba Rao in this Journal (*ante*, vol. IV p 72 ff.) and by Mr. V. Rangachari, in the *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XIX. p. 254 ff. with titles "The Pulimbaru plates of the Chalukya king Jayasimha" and "The Pulimbaru plates of the Eastern Chalukya king Jayasimha I. respectively.

LITERARY GLEANINGS NO. XI.

IDENTITY OF SURESVARA.

M. RAMAKRISHNA KAVI, M.A.

- १ “प्रसिद्धं हि तस्य द्वेषाद्भाषणं कथां वहति दुर्बुद्धे इत्यादि । एक एवास्य कृतप्रयत्नस्यापि परमहंसद्वेषं शास्त्रे चाकौशलमुन्नीय काश्मीरकपण्डितैर्न ग्रन्थो निबद्धः । किं च प्रसिद्धाप्रवाक्यैर्विश्वरूपप्रभाकरगुरुमण्डन वाचस्पति सुचरितमिश्रैः शिष्टाग्रणीभिः परिगृहीतस्य कथं द्वेषमोहाभ्यां विनापलापसंभवः” । (न्यायरत्नदीपावली—३.)
- २ “ननु विश्वरूपप्रभाकरौ भक्तपक्षपतितौ । तावप्येकदण्डिनौ प्रसिद्धौ । एवं तर्हि तादृशस्सन्यासस्तत्प्रमाणश्च नापलापमर्हति । न हि तादृशः सर्वज्ञकल्पाः स्वपुरुषार्थनाशे बुद्धिपूर्वं प्रवर्तन्ते । गृहस्थावस्थायां विरचिते विश्वरूपग्रन्थे दर्शितवाक्यपरिग्रहादृश्यते । न चासौ ग्रन्थः सन्यासिना विरचितः तथा हि परिव्राजकाचार्य सुरेश्वर विरचितेति नाम लिखेत् । लिखितं तु भट्टविश्वरूपविरचितेति । तस्मात्प्रसिद्ध शिष्टपरिगृहीतयोर्मलय हिमालयादिनिलय विद्वदुपासितयोर्वाक्य तदर्थयोर्द्वेषमात्रात्न विवदितव्यम्” ॥ (न्यायरत्नदीपावली—३)

3 Ānandagiri's Commentary on the second quotation.

एवं तर्हीति । किं च गार्हस्थ्ये स्थित्वैव निबन्धनिर्माणान्न विश्वरूपाचार्य पक्षपाताशङ्केत्याह गृहस्थेति । विश्वरूपनिबन्धनस्यापि कथं गृहस्थ विरचितत्वं तत्राह न चेति । सति नामान्तरे प्राचीननाम्ना सन्यासिनां ग्रन्थनिर्माणादप्येत्यर्थः । भट्टविश्वरूपविरचितनामाङ्कितस्तु प्रत्यध्यायं तन्निबद्धस्तत्र तत्रोपलभ्यते । अतो गृहस्थावस्थायामेव तन्निर्माणान्न पक्षपाताशङ्केत्याह लिखितन्त्विति ।

In one of the Literary Gleanings passages leading to the identity of Surēśvara with Maṇḍana and Viśvarūpa were given and an attempt was made to show that Surēśvara was known as Viśvarūpa when he was a *grhastha*. It was also doubted whether he was same as Maṇḍana.

A passage in Ānandānubhava's *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* with its commentary by Ānandagiri is pertinent to the point while it throws a flood of light on other matters which may entertain curiosity of critics,

Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī may be distinguished from *Nyāyadīpāvalī* of Ānandabōdha commented upon by Ānandagiri. Ānandānubhava is a different author from Ānandabōdha.¹ Ānandagiri states in his commentary on *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī* that he wrote his work under the Kalinga king Nṛsiṃha probably at the *Śaṅkara Maṭha* at Jagannātha.² His spiritual preceptor was Śudhānanda and Vijñānātman while Chitsukhāchārya also studied under the former of the two. Ānandagiri is generally assigned to A.D. 1200; hence Ānandānubhava and also Ānandabōdha must have lived at least half a century prior to Ānandagiri. Ānandabōdha seems to have flourished earlier than Ānandānubhava. The latter is the author of two more works *Padārthartattva* and a commentary on *Iśṭasiddhi*; the former of the two is a treatise on the categories of *Vaiśeṣikas* as defined by the *Vedāntins*. *Iśṭasiddhi* was written by Vimuktātman who alludes to Surēśvara. Ānandānubhava was a pupil of Nārāyaṇa-Jyōtiṣh-pūjyapāda of whom nothing is known. He mentions Maṇḍana, Vāchaspati, Prabhākara, Kumārila, Śuśharitamiśra, Ānandabōdha and other ancient writers. His probably is the earliest mention of Sucharita Miśra, one of the commentators on *Ślokaṅkāra*

The passage in question read with the commentary reveals a number of points worthy of note:—

(i) that Viśvarūpa and Prabhākara³ both became *Sanyāsins* of *Ekadāṇḍin* class and they were honoured by the learned men living

1. Ānandabōdha a pupil of Ātmavāsa, wrote a commentary on *Śābdunirṇayadīpikā* of Prakāśātman. The commentary is known by the name of *Nyāyadīpikā*. Chitsukha, a contemporary of Ānandagiri commented upon the works of Ānandabōdha. Ānandānubhava is different from any of these writers and also must be distinguished from Ānandāranya, teacher of Jñānāmṛta, a commentator on *Naishkarmyasiddhi*. Ānandagiri is a voracious writer on *Vedānta*, *Tripurārivivarna*, *Upasadanavyākhyā*, *Ātmajñāna vyākhyā*, *Harimēdevyākhyā*, *Upādhikhaṇḍana* among his works, are also available. The last work was noticed by Vādīndra. Ānandānubhava was identified with Gangāpuri in the introduction to *Tarkasaṅgraha* which is not warranted by the facts in our possession.

२ कलिङ्गदेशाधिपतौ नरेन्द्रे भुवं प्रशासत्यमरेन्द्रनुत्ये ।

नृसिंहदेवे जगदेकवीरे नरोत्तमेऽकारि मया निबन्धः ॥ तर्कविवेक VI

This statement of Ānandagiri supports the opinion that he lived at Jagannātha in Kalinga country and not at Dvārakā as asserted in the preface of *Tarkasaṅgraha* of Ānandagiri.

3 It is doubted whether Kumārila, against tradition assumed *sanyasa* for a passage in Jñānāmṛta's commentary on *Naishkarmyasiddhi* leads to that conclusion

“‘मृदितकाषायणाणामेवैतत् कथनीयं,’ ‘विदुषि नोत्तरं देयम्,’ ‘आनुमानिको निरस्तः,’ इत्यादिना स्वरूपमेव भेदो वस्तुनो न वस्तुव्यतिरेकेण भेदोऽस्ति...तान् प्रत्यव्यक्तमेवेति

between "the Himalayas and the Malaya" that is, throughout India, (ii) that Viśvarūpa wrote his work in which he describes rules for *Sanyāsārama* while he was still a *grhastā*, (iii) that his name was changed to Surēśvara when he became a *sanyāsin*. This reference clearly establishes that Viśvarūpa became Surēśvara. The statement that Maṇḍana was the same as Viśvarūpa as mentioned in Śankara-vijaya ascribed to Vidyāranya is negated by the first part of the passage in which Maṇḍana and Viśvarūpa are spoken of as two different persons.

The identity of Umbēka either with Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpa may attract some notice. In *Śankaravijaya* Maṇḍana is used as another name for Viśvarūpa and Umbēka. This synonymous nomenclature was not used by any other writer who wrote on the life of Śankara. Chidānanda in his *Śankaravijaya* says that, Śankara won over Viśvarūpa and made him a *Sanyāsin*, bestowing on him the name of Surēśvara. Vyāsachala relates the same account. Umbēka is nowhere mentioned as a synonym of Maṇḍana or Viśvarūpa except in Vidyāranya's *Śankaravijaya*. In one of our *Gleanings* Umbēka was identified with Bhavabhūti. The identification of Bhavabhūti with Viśvarūpa rests only on two pieces of evidence.⁴ Both the commentators on *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* state that Bhavabhūti, Viśvarūpa and Surēśvara are the names of one man who wrote a commentary on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* called *Bālakriḍā*.

From evidence of style Maṇḍana, Umbēka and Viśvarūpa must be treated as entirely different persons; for all the works of Maṇḍana are written in terse difficult style. His vocabulary is highly technical. He allows no humour to mar the seriousness of his arguments. He is very vehement especially in his attacks on Prabhākara whose general humour combined with his mastery of tongue far surpasses any of his rivals with the probable exception of Śankara. Umbēka writes in easy graceful style. His attacks are couched in mild and precise language. Viśvarūpa or Surēśvara shows less command over the language but is more vehement than

मुक्त्वान्यत्प्रतिसिद्धान्तां दर्शयति । परमहंसाश्रमानुष्ठानपूर्वं ममलाग्रन्थे भट्टाचार्याः
'पुनः प्रयाति वेदान्तनिषेवणेन' इत्यादिना मुक्तकमुक्तवन्तः" (*Ślokarvārtikā*)

Tradition has so strongly possessed our credence that we cannot accept the above statement without further corroboration.

4 (a) यत्प्रसादादयं लोको धर्ममार्गं स्थितः सुखी ।

भवभूति सुरेशाख्यं विश्वरूपं प्रपाम्यतम् ॥

Bālakriḍāvyākhyā.

(b) भवभूतिनिबन्धनोदधौ तिभिभीमप्रतिवादके गुरोः ।

सकटाक्षनिरीक्षणप्लवः पतितं मामयमुद्धरिष्यति ॥

Vachanamālā, (another

commentary on Viśvarūpa's Bālakriḍā)

Umbaka in his attacks on Prabhākara an older writer on *Sāṅkhya* and *Vīdānta*. These differences stand out in bold relief against their identity.⁵

No attempt to establish the identity of Surēśvara will be complete if the statement found in *Śaṅkaravijaya* that Maṇḍana became Surēśvara is not properly explained. Why should the author of *Śaṅkaravijaya*, be he Vidyāranya or anybody else, identify Viśvarūpa and Maṇḍana and give a poetic colour to philosophical conquest of Sankara? Works of Maṇḍana and Surēśvara have many common thoughts, arguments, and even expressions. If their identity is denied similarity in thought and expression may border upon Surēśvara's 'plagiarism' as he lived a few decades later than Maṇḍana. It may particularly be noted that a series of arguments in *Sambandhavārtikā* of Surēśvara appears to be mere paraphrase in verse of the second and third chapters of Maṇḍana's *Brahmasiddhi*. In two or three places common verses occur without any alteration.⁶ This commonness prompted later readers to identify them

5 Maṇḍana is a supporter of Bhaṭṭarīhari in *Śūdalabrahmavāda*. He says in his *Brahmasiddhi*,⁽¹⁾ “सर्वं ज्ञेयं वाग्रूपान्वितं गम्यत इति तद्विकारस्त द्विवर्तो वा”

(2) “सर्वप्रत्ययवशे वा ब्रह्मरूपे व्यवस्थिते । प्रपञ्चस्य प्रविलयः शब्देन प्रतिपाद्यते ॥

Bhaṭṭarīhari's *vivarta* theory was adopted by some old Mīmāṃsā writers as Brahmanandin, who in his commentary on chapter VI. says,

“तथा च ब्रह्मनन्दी वर्णित्ताधिकारिदृष्ट्यपेक्षया षष्ठेऽध्याये विवर्तमेव विदांचकार”.

Amṛtānanda, Maṇḍana, and Brahmanandi appear to follow Bhaṭṭarīhari in their *vivarta* theory.

6 Compare the following:—

(1) In *Brahmasiddhi*, Tarkakāṇḍa, *vyitti* under the fifth *śloka* reads:—

भेदः परस्परानात्मस्वभावः स चेद्वस्तुनः स्वभावः, वस्तूनामभावप्रसङ्गः ।

Vartika—वस्तुनो भेदरूपत्वे वस्त्वभाषः प्रसज्यते । (954)

(2) Maṇḍana—पौरुषेयीमपेक्षां च न हि वस्त्वनुवर्तते ।

पित्वादिविषयेऽपेक्षा जननादिप्रभाविता ॥

एकक्रियाविशेषण व्यपेक्षा ह्रस्वदीर्घयोः ।

अर्थक्रियाकृते भेदे रूपभेदो न लभ्यते ।

दाहपाकविभागेन कुशानुर्न हि भेदवान् ॥

Surēśvara—सत्त्वं वस्तु कथं भिन्त्यात्पुंव्यपेक्षाविनिर्मितः ।

भेदः पुत्तादिभावेन जन्यत्वं वस्तुकल्पितम् ।

दाहपाकप्रकाशादिभेदेऽप्यग्रेरभिन्नता ।

कार्यतोऽपि न भेदः स्याद्वस्त्वभेदव्यवस्थितेः (956—7)

instead of attributing plagiarism to Surēśvara. Unless proper explanation is sought to justify the commonness, it will still be a strong argument in favour of their identity. *Sambandhavārtikā* was meant as an introduction by Surēśvara to his versified commentary on Śankara's *Brhadāranyabhāshya*. The subject matter of this introduction is not found in Śankara's *Bhāshya*. It extends over 1500 verses. What was the occasion for such a long preface? It is veritably a severe attack on Prabhākara and Bhartriprapancha. Maṇḍana frequently indulged in it. The third chapter of his *Brahmasiddhi* which forms more than half the work is devoted to destroy the *Niyōga* theory of Prabhākara.⁷ Against this attack Prabhā-

(3) Maṇḍana—यथैव भिन्नशक्तीनांमभिन्नं रूपमाश्रयः ।

तथैव नानाक्रियाहेतुरूपं किं नाभ्युपेयते ॥

Surēśvara—विभिन्नकार्यकत्रीणां शक्तीनां यद्वदाश्रयः ।

न विरुद्धोऽग्निरेकोपि तद्वक्तार्येऽपि किं न ते ॥ (958)

(4) Maṇḍana—न खलु प्रमाणान्तरसंभितार्थमपि वचो न प्रमाणं, प्रमाणमेव ह्यप्र

Surēśvara—मानान्तरेणापि संबद्धमर्थं वाक्यं प्रबोधयत् । [वाक्यम् । (III)

मानतां न जहात्येव जगत्याप्तवचो यथा ॥ (703)

(5) Maṇḍana—अस्तु वा मानयोग्यत्वं सत्त्वं तच्च प्रतीयते ।

तथापि वस्तुपरता नागमस्य विहन्यते ॥ (III—51)

Surēśvara—यदापि मानयोग्यत्वं सत्त्वं तच्च प्रतीयते ।

तदापि वस्तुपरता नागमस्य विहन्यते ॥ (705)

(6) Maṇḍana—तस्यैवमनुमेयत्वे कथं शब्दैकगोचरः ।

तस्यापि शब्दपूर्वत्वादनुमानैकगोचरः ॥

कस्मान्न शब्दबोधोऽपि ह्यनुमानपुरस्सरः ।

नेदं प्रथमतालभ्या बीजाङ्कुरवदेतयोः

शब्दाद्बोद्धुश्चानुमानं सर्वस्यैव पुरः स्थितम् ॥ (III—80, 81)

Surēśvara—संबन्धं मन्यते योऽपि शाब्दबोधानुसारिणीम् ।

दृष्टुं श्रोत्रगां सोऽपि न सम्यगभिधीयते

श्रोतृस्थकार्याल्लिङ्गत्वादिति चेल्लिङ्गपूर्वतः

कस्मान्न शब्दबोधोऽपि ह्यनुमानपुरस्सरः ।

नियोगशब्दतो बुध्वा योऽपि श्रोता प्रवर्तते ।

तस्याप्यनुमितेरेव शब्दार्थप्रत्ययो भवेत् ॥ (732—8)

⁷ The *niyoga* interpretation of *Bhāshya* appears to have been in vogue long before Prabhākara, as evidence by Bhartrihari's *vṛtti* or *Vakypadiya*. It had opponents among *niyayikas* and Prabhākara probably re-stated it on a sounder basis;

kara and Śālikanātha, his pupil and commentator on his works, denounce the *Bhāṭṭa* interpretations on *Śābara-Bhāṣya*, of which school, Maṇḍana was then the leader. In reply to these attacks Surēśvara had to write his preface in which repeating all the arguments of Maṇḍana, supplements his own, to defeat Śālikanātha. This phase of development was long forgotten by later scholars who were separated from the real combatants by several centuries and they were naturally reluctant to attribute plagiarism to Surēśvara and imagined his identity with Maṇḍana. It is not uncommon among Śāstric writers to incorporate or modify portions of thought or expression of their predecessors. Bhōja's *Srngāraprakāśa* and *Bhāvaprakāśa* and a host of writers in *Darśanas* adopt this mode of writing. Every śāstric writer firmly believes and says that he simply explains or summarises what his master or predecessors said. Sense of one's originality and self-authority are, only the modern traits leading to the doctrines of plagiarism.

Prabhākara was for some centuries at least as great as Surēśvara. His powerful arguments stood in the way of every theorist who could not establish himself unless he defeated Prabhākara's theories. The passage quoted by Ānandānubhava sufficiently proclaims equality of reputation enjoyed by Prabhākara and his rival Surēśvara. One more instance may be adduced in this connection to maintain the same fact. In the middle of a *Malabar Manuscript*, a single leaf apparently containing the beginning of a *Vedānta* work was found. The first verse devoted to the praise of the *Guru* of the author runs thus :—

प्रपञ्चपृथ्वीधर भेदतत्परः सदादृतन्याय सहस्रदर्शनः ।

गुरुप्रियो यः सुमनोभिरीडितः सुरेशवद्भाति गुरुं नमामि तम्॥

There is a tripple entendre in the verse. Prabhākara and Surēśvara are saluted, the third sense comparing them to Indra. Prapañcha and Prithvīthara mentioned therein are probably *Bhedābhe'davādins* whom Surēśvara criticises in his *Vārtikā* and the latter as a writer, on Philosophy is occasionally referred to. *Vyāyusahasradarśana* means Mīmāṃsa in which both Surēśvara and Prabhākara were specialists. Reference to Indra is only a poetic device negligible in historic estimate.

In *Nājāyaratnadīpavalī* an occasion for mentioning Viśvarūpa and Prabhākara arose in the course of a discussion whether *tridandanyasa* was sanctioned by the śāstras. Passages were cited from various works by Ānandānubhava in course of which Viśvarūpa's commentary on *Yājñavalkyaśruti* called *Bālakrīḍā* was cited. The citations are found in the commentary now available in print. Besides the reference to *Bālakrīḍā* Ānandānubhava mentions a commentary on *Kauśītakasūtra* as of equal authority which from the context in coupling the names of Prabhākara and Viśvarūpa seems to have been written by Prabhākara.

THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN GANGAS OF KALINGA*

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.,

Chapter I.

SOURCES EXAMINED.

Foreign and Indigenous literatures. Inscriptions on copper plates, stones and coins. Archaeological remains.

KALINGA is one of the oldest countries in India and references to it are found in Epics, *Purāṇas*, *Sūtras* and works of classical writers like Pliny, Ptolemy and Arrian who derived their knowledge probably from *The Indica* of Megasthenes. Inscriptions on stones and copper plates also allude to it. The country is apparently named after the tribes of Kalingas that lived therein. In *Mahābhārata*, we get references made to the Kalingas three times, on each occasion in the company of different tribes. The Sanskrit name *Trikalinga* probably refers to the three tribes amongst the Kalingas. In the great war of the *Mahābhārata*, these tribes fought most heroically on the side of the Kurus as against the Pāṇḍavas but were defeated. One of these three tribes seems to be the Gāṅgas or the Gāṅga Kalingas and the earliest reference to them is found in the works of classical writers whose statements are based on Megasthenes's *Indika*. About B.C. 295 Megasthenes was sent by Seleucus Nicator as an envoy to Chandragupta Maurya at whose court in Pāṭāliputra (modern Pāṭna) he lived and wrote his famous work which unfortunately was lost but from which extracts were taken and published by Pliny, Arrian and others. Quintus Curtius Rufus, in his *History of Alexander the Great*¹ tells us that Alexander learnt from prince Bhagala that on the further bank of the Ganges lived two great nations, the *Gangaridai* and the *Prasii* (Prachya = Eastern) whose king Agrammes (Xandrames = Sandrokottos) kept in the field for guarding his country, 20,000 cavalry and as much infantry besides 2000 four horsed chariots and 3000 elephants. This account of the military strength was confirmed by Porus who also stated that the then king was of the very meanest origin, his father being a barber. So, though Alexander exhorted the troops to march against the land of the Gangarides and Prasii, the army refused

* The writer of the article has edited for the Society in Telugu a work called *Kalingadesacharitra* (850 pp Price Rs' 7-8-0) and one of his contributions to it deals with the History of the Eastern Gangas. In a series of articles the writer hopes to publish some of the chapters of his work relating to that dynasty.

1 *Mc Crindle's Ancient India its invasion by Alexander the great* pp. 221-222.

to move partly owing to fear and partly owing to aversion for further wars. Diodoros Siculus in his *Bibliotheca Historica*² states that Alexander obtained from Phēgelas an account of the country beyond the Indus a desert and then the river Ganges and finally the dominion of the nation of the *Praisiōi* and *Gandaridai*, whose king Xandrames had an army of 20,000 horse, 200,000 infantry, 2000 chariots and 4000 elephants. Poros confirmed the account and added that the king of the *Gandaridai* was a worthless man being the son of a barber. Alexander exhorted his troops for the expedition against the *Gandaridai* but in vain.

Plutarch's life of Alexander³ informs us that Alexander's army refused to advance to the Ganges because the kings of the *Gandaritai* and the *Praisiāi* were reported to possess a very large army. So, Alexander erected altars for the gods which the kings of the *Praisiāi* worshipped in Greek fashion. Androkottos (more correctly Sandrakypotos or Chandra-pupta) then a youth saw Alexander and afterwards declared that he would have easily defeated him as he was hated by his subjects on account of the wickedness of his disposition and the meanness of his origin.

Mc Crindle gives the following account of the *Gangaridai*⁴ :—

NOTE CC.—THE GANGARIDAI

"This people occupied the country about the mouths of the Ganges, and may best be described as the inhabitants of Lower Bengal. The likeness of their name to that of the *Gandaridai*, the people of *Gandhāra*, whose seats were in the neighbourhood of the Indus and the *Kōphēn* or *Kābul* river, has been the source of much confusion and error. Fortunately the notice of them in the *Indika* of Megasthenes has been preserved both by Pliny and Solinus, from whom we learn that they were a branch of the great race of the *Calingae*, that their capital was *Parthalis* (Bardwan?), and that their king had an army of 60,000 foot, 1000 horse, and 700 elephants, which was always ready for action (Pliny, vi. 18; Solin. 52). They are mentioned in Ptolemy's *Geography* as a people who dwelt about the mouth of the Ganges and whose capital was *Gangē*. The name of the *Gangaridai* has nothing corresponding with it in Sanskrit, nor can it be, as Lassen supposed, a designation first invented by the Greeks, for Phegelas used it in describing to Alexander the races that occupied the regions beyond the *Hyphasis*. According to Saint-Martin, their name is preserved in that of the *Gonghris* of S. Bihār, with whom were connected the *Gangayis* of North-Western and the *Gangrār* of Eastern Bengal. These designations he takes to be but variations of the name which was originally common to them all. Wilford, in his article on the chronology of the Hindus (*Asiat. Res.* v. p. 269), says that "the greatest part of Bengal

2 *Ibid* pp 281—283.

3 *Ibid* pp. 310—311.

4 *Ibid* Note Cc.—The *Gangaridai* in the appendices pp. 864—365

was known in Sanskrit under the name of Gancaradesa, or 'country of Gancara,' from which the Greeks made Gangari-desā. But this view must be rejected on the same ground as Lassen's. The Gangaridai are mentioned by Virgil, *Georg.* iii. l. 27. As their king, at the time when Megasthenes recorded the strength of the army which he maintained was subject to Magadha, we may infer that Sandrocottos treated the various potentates who submitted to his arms as Alexander treated Taxiles and Pōros, permitting them to retain as his vassals the power and dignity which they had previously enjoyed."

From the above mentioned classical accounts, we learn that in Alexander's time (B. C. 325), the *Calinga Gangas* and the *Prāchya Magadhas* were living along the whole valley of the river Ganges and they were ruled by Agramanes. The account given by them is confirmed by Jain *Parisiṣṭa-parvan* and *Mahābhārata*.⁵ The latter work called the first Nanda by the name of Ugrasēna and so his son Augrasainya Xandromanes might have been termed Agramanes by the classical writers.⁶ The *Purāṇas* name the first Nanda as Mahāpadmananda and describe him as *Śūdra-garbhodbhava* (born of Śūdra mother), *Sarva kṣatrāntaka* (destroyer of all the kṣatriyas) and *Ēkarāt* or *Ēcacchatra* (Sole monarch of the whole earth).⁷ Probably as pointed out by Pargiter⁸ all the old kṣtriya dynasties which reigned from the time of the great Mahābhārata war to the end of the Saisunaga rule (Aikṣvākus, Pāṇchālas, Kāśis, Haihayas, Kalingas, Aśvakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Sūrasenas, Vitiḥōtras) were destroyed by the Nanda Emperor Mahāpadmananda whose title seems to be Ugrasena. His son Augrasainya was Dhana Nanda who may be identified with Agramanes of the classical accounts. It is thus clear that about B. C. 325 when Alexander subdued the Indus Valley, the Nandas were ruling over the various tribes of the Ganges Valley and in particular over the Gangarides or Ganga Calingas and the Prasii or Magadhas. The Gāngas occupied Vanga but were subject to the rulers of Palibhotra or Pataliputra, viz, the Nandas and after them the Māuryas.

From the fragments of the Indika of Megasthenes collected by Dr. Schwanbeck, we learn that the Gāngaridai occupied the country lying between the rivers Ganges in the north and Damodar in the south and Magadha in the west and the Sea Coast in the east. Megasthenes was the envoy of Seleukos at the court of Sibyrtios, satrap of Arachosia and later on, was sent to Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Chandragupta Maurya about B.C. 300. He obtained most of his knowledge from the Brahmins who were the rulers (ministers) of the states. According to his account,⁹ the Ganges flowed from North to South and emptied its

5 Raychaudhuri's *Political History of Ancient India*. p. 140

6 *Ibid* p. 141 7 Pargiter's *Dynasties of Kali Age* p. 25

8 *Ibid* p. 23

9 Ancient India by Megasthenes and Arrian, p 32.

waters into the ocean forming the *eastern* boundary of the Gangaridai, a nation which possessed a vast force of the largest sized elephants. Owing to this, their country has never been conquered by any foreign king, for all other nations dread the overwhelming number and strength of these animals. Thus Alexander the Makedonian, after conquering all Asia, did not make war upon the Gangaridai as he did on all others; for when he had arrived with all his troops at the river Ganges, and had subdued all the other Indians he abandoned as hopeless an invasion of the Gangaridai when he learned that they possessed four thousand elephants well trained and equipped for war.

Pliny in his *Natural History* has described the Indian races and in the lower part of the valley of the Ganges he locates the Brachmanæ "a name comprising many tribes, among which are the Macco calingæ... The tribes called Calingæ are nearest the sea, and higher up are the Mandei and the Malli in whose country is Mount Mallus, the boundary of all that district being the Ganges. The final part of its course is said to be through the country of the Gangarides. The Royal city of the Calingæ is called Parthalis. Over their king 60,000 foot soldiers, 1000 horseman and 700 elephants keep watch and ward in precinct of war". Thus the *Gangis* seem to be a branch of the Kalingas.

According to Pliny, another tribe called Modo Calingæ occupied a large island in the Ganges, and beyond them lived several tribes chief among them being Andaræ and Mandæ. The distance from the mouth of the Ganges to cape Calingæ and the town of Dandagula is said to be 625 miles (?) Another writer Solin, in his catalogue of Indian races states that the people living in the farthest part are the Gangarides whose king possesses 1000 horse, 700 elephants and 60000 foot. In the Ganges there was a populous island occupied by a powerful nation whose king had 50,000 foot and 4000 horse.

Diodorus Siculus who wrote his *Bibliotheke* in Rome during the time of Julius Caesar and the Emperor Augustus and who has given a general description of India and Alexander's Indian Campaigns states¹ that India was inhabited then by very many nations, 'amongst which the

10 *Ibid* Pp 133—139. McCrindle identifies the *Macco Calingæ* with Maghas of Kalinga, Magahars of Nepal, Maghyas of S.Bihar, Magras of Bengal, and Magors of Orissa. The *Modogalingai* are identified with people of Mada who lived close to Andhra. The *Gangaridæ* or *Gangarides* occupied the region of lower Bengal and consisted of various indigenous tribes. At the time of Alexander's invasion they and the Prasii were considered too powerful to be attacked, M. de. St. Martin thinks that these tribes were non-Aryan but gradually became aryanised. He thinks that the Goughirs of S. Bihar are the descendants of the Gangaridæ and their town of Parthalis is the modern Burdwan. Ptolemy calls it Kalinganagara. The Gangaridæ are mentioned by Virgil as being famous for elephants.

11 Vide p. 201 Ancient India by J. W. M'Crindle.

greatest was that of the Gandaridai (Gangaridai, the people of Bengal) against whom Alexander did not undertake an expedition, being deterred by the multitude of their elephants. This region was separated from farther India by the greatest river in those parts but it adjoins the rest of India which Alexander had conquered.'

Regarding indigenous literature, there are works written recently which deal with the history of the Later Eastern Gangas and those too in an incorrect manner. One such work is the Sanskrit Kāvya known as *Gangavamsānucharitam*, composed by an Oriya poet known as Vasudeva Ratha Somayaji, the court poet of Sri Purushottama Deva of Gudari Kataka line who had his capital at Pratapagiri Vijayanagaram in Ganjam District and who lived in the beginning of the 18th century A.D. The author gives an incorrect geneological and chronological account of the Ganga kings who ruled at Katak and describes that first of all, 6 *Devas* ruled and then 6 *Nṛsimhas* and finally 6 *Phānus*. All this account is opposed to the Epigraphical evidences now found. Though some of the traditional accounts mentioned therein regarding the origins of the Later Ganga and Gajapathi lines at Katāk appear to be true, other historical details regarding the order of kings and dates are wrong.

Recently, an Oriya prose chronicle called *Gangavamsāvali* has been discovered^{11-a} but it gives the geneology of a branch of the Later Gangavamsi kings i.e. of the line of Parlakimidi.

The most important source, though much vitiated, is the *Mādālā Pāñji* chronicle kept in the Puri-Jaganath temple. Based on it, Stirling and Hunter and other historians have constructed their accounts which are therefore not very satisfactory. The *Mādālā Pāñji* was composed in Oriya at the end of the 16th century during the reign of Ramachandra Dev, the ruler of Khurda. So, the history of the kings mentioned therein since 3101 B.C. is not properly dealt with. The geneology and chronology of the Later Ganga kings mentioned therein are wrong, though a few germs of historical truth are found, here and there, in the Annals.

From all these accounts, it is clear that Kalinga was ruled over by the Early Ganga kings in the 7th century A.D. About the middle of that century, the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Yuan Chwang visited the country and has left an account of the religious and social conditions of the kingdom.¹² Though he does not name the ruling king or dynasty, we have to note that his description relates to the Ganga rule over Kalinga. The discovery of several copper plate Inscriptions of the Early Ganga kings in Kalingadesa (Ganjam and Vijagapatam Districts) and the probability that they belong to the period extending from the beginning of the

11.a Vide J.A.H.R.S. vol. II pts. 2 3 & 4 pp 250—258

12 Vide Siyuki (Travels of Yuan Chwang) translated by Watters 2 vols,

6th century A. D. to the close of the 10th century A. D. would confirm the same conclusion.

The most important Sources for the Ganga history are four-fold:—

1. Epigraphical 2. Numismatic 3. Archaeological and 4. Literary.

1. The Epigraphical source is of two varieties :—

(a) Copper Plates (b) Stone Inscriptions.

(a) The copper plates of this dynasty which are so far discovered and which throw much valuable light on Ganga history and civilisation number nearly thirty and their dates vary from the year 28¹³ to the year 526.¹⁴ It has been correctly held by the writer who edited the grant of the year 28, that its donor was an Early Ganga king and that the year 28 relates to Ganga Era, because the engraver of the plate continuously engraved the plates of successive kings whose grants mention Gangavamsa and Ganga Era. The grant of the year 526 was briefly noticed in the Epigraphical report for 1918—1919 and it relates to Madhukāmaravadeva son of Anantavarma and is dated in Gāṅgēya Vamsa Pravarddhamāna Vijaya Rājya Samvatsara 526 (in 526 of the prosperous and victorious year of the rule of Gangas). In most of the grants, the Era of the Gangas is referred to and though at one time the solution of the problem of Ganga Era appeared to be hard, it is now settled¹⁵ by the discovery of this record of 526 Ganga Era of Madhukāmarava who, I take it, is the predecessor of Anantavarma Vajrahasta whose coronation date is given in Saka year 960.

There are several copper plates of a later date belonging to both the Eastern and Western Ganga dynasties which relate the origin of the Gangas. These are the C. P. grants of Anantavarma Chodaganga dated Saka 1034 and 1040¹⁶ which narrate the origin and early fortunes of the Gangas. But the account given in the grants of the western Gangas of Talkad about their origin would appear to be more trustworthy. There are also three C.P. grants of Narasimha II,¹⁷ which give complete geneology of the dynasty, and two Puri Plates of Narasimha IV.,¹⁸ the last but one king of the dynasty, which carry the geneology still further

There are several C.P. grants of Kadamba princes,¹⁹ discovered in Kalinga, in which their names are mentioned in relation to the Ganga kings. These throw much light on the Ganga origin and administration.

13 Vide the Tirilingi C.P. grant edited in J.A.H.R.S. vol. III pt. I pp 54—57

14 Vide No. 3 in the list of C.P. grants found in A.R. of S.I.Ep. for 1918-19.

15 Vide pp. 71—80 in Kalingadesa Charitra published by me.

16 Vide Indian Antiquary vol 13 and J.A.H.R.S. vol 1 part 1. Also Mysore and Coorg by Lewis Rice p' 30

17 Vide Viswakosa vol 5 and Beng. As. Soc. J. vols LXXII and LXV

18 Vide J As Soc Beng 1895 pp 128—154

19 Vide pp 175—178 in J.A.H.R.S. vol III Pts. 2, 3, & 4

In addition to the C.P. grants of the Eastern and Western Gangas and Kadambas, those granted by kings of contemporary dynasties e.g. the Vishnukundins, the Eastern Chalukyas, the Chedi Kalachuris and the Cholas throw a flood of light on Ganga History. Till the time of Madhukāmārṇava of Ganga year 526 who is the predecessor of Anantavarma Vajrahasta III. and who, according to the śāka dates given in Vajrahasta's several Grants, ruled from Saka 941 to 959, we have to rely on the evidences supplied by these copper plate grants.

(b) But from his time and even a little earlier, we get, in increasing numbers, several stone inscriptions inscribed on the walls of the Mukhalingam, Draksharāmam, Palur Vateswaram, Sreekurman Simhachellam, Mahendragiri, Puri-Jaganadham, Neeleswaram and other temples and from these, we can get a reliable and continuous story of the Later Ganga rule. The names of all the kings with Saka and Anka dates as well as those of the ministers and other officers are given. Most of the inscriptions are written in Telugu, the language which was then spoken, as now, all along the sea coast tract extending from Nellore in the South to Chatrapur in the North. A few inscriptions are written in Oriya and Sanskrit. Almost all these have been copied by the Madras Epigraphical department and referred to in Ep. Reports. In recent years, several hundreds of them are published in South Indian Inscriptions, vols. IV, V, and VI. and more await publication.

2 Another valuable source is provided by the Ganga Fanams or *Vanga Parakalu* as they are called from their close resemblance in size and shape, to the brinjal seeds. These coins are made of gold and bear on one side the letter '*Gan*' and a numerical number (the regnal year) and on the other, a couchant Bull with *Līngam* and *Pānupattam*.

They are very small so that they might be accessible to one and all. The couchant bull facing left, is dressed and above it is found a crescent of the moon. The bull and the moon are found on their seals also. The coins are of $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ fanam values and range in weight between 1 to 5 grains.

3 Yet another valuable source is provided by the discovery of antiquarian relics such as statues, coins, stone and brick implements and pottery at Sālihundam, Mukhalingam, Nagarikatakam, Dantapuram, all in the Ganjam district where the Gāṅgas ruled till 1132 A. D.. The existence of the several temples with their peculiar sculpture and architecture adds considerably to our knowledge of Ganga origin and civilisation.

4 Valuable evidence which relates to the Later Ganga period only is supplied to the Scholars by the Muhamadan writings such as *Tabakātī-najirī*, *Tārīkhī Fīroz Shāhi* and Tamil writings like *Kalingāttuparaṇi* and Oriya writings like *Mādalā Pāñji*.

THE GANGA ERA*

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

Introduction.

The Ganga kings ruled over Kalingadeśa, originally over Ganjam District, and later on, over the whole area extending from the river Ganges in the North to the river Godavari in the South. This was from the close of the 5th century A. D. to the middle of the 15th century A. D. They belong to a powerful line; but still very little is known to scholars about this dynasty. In their copper plate grants, they mention an Era, called *Gāṅgēya Vamśa Pravardhamāna Vijaya Rājya Samvatsara* and in this Era are found plates extending over 526 years. Several attempts are made to fix the initial year of the Era, in the period ranging from 349 A.D. to 720 A.D. This paper adduces new evidences and fixes the initial year of the Era in 492—493 A.D.

Origin and Early Abode of the Gāṅgas Examined.

They are first mentioned in Magasthenes Indika (Vide Mc Crindle's translation, pp. 133--138) as *Gāṅgarides* through whose country the river Ganges continued to flow. Their country is called *Calinga* and since they lived in it they are called *Gangaridae-calingae*. They are described as Prachi-Gangaridae or Ganga tribe living in the East who were subject to the control of the Mauryan Emperor, Chandragupta. The copper plate inscriptions of Anantavarma Chodaganga Deva of 11th century A. D. state that this dynasty was Lunar in descent, and that the 6th member Tūrvasu being childless, prayed to Goddess Ganga and had a son Gangēya and hence the dynasty was named after him. The 16th king in descent from Gangēya had his capital at Kōlāhalapura in Gāṅgavādi Vishaya and built a temple for Siva. After 81 kings ruled there, Vīrasimha came to the throne and conquered the whole of South India. After his death, his brother usurping the throne, his five sons had to go eastward and settle on Mahēndragiri. After defeating Balāditya, they subdued Kalinga and made Dantapura, their capital.

According to the Geneology and Chronology given in the above inscriptions, we get the starting time of this dynasty in the early part of the 8th century A.D.

* A paper presented to the 6th All India Oriental Conference held at Patna in December 1930

*Gangēya Vamsa Pravardhamāna Vijaya Rājyā Samvatsara.**(The prosperous and victorious year of Ganga dynasty).**Several theories examined:*

a. Robert Sewell in his sketch of the *Dynasties of South India* P. 43, writing about the Gangas of Kalinga has made the statement that "owing to anarchy in Eastern Chalukya territories from 977 A.D., the Kalinga Gangas rose to power and hence two inscriptions found at Chiccacole recording grants made by Devendra and his son Satya in the same year, namely the fifty first year of the reign of the Gangēya vamsa, at Kalinganagara, would date from 977 A.D." He further adds "If pure conjecture may be allowed a place in a publication of this kind, I would note as a possible explanation of these figures, that as the Kalinga country lay between the territories of Orissa and those of Eastern Chalukyas it is possible that the ancient family may have partially reestablished themselves and founded a dynasty about the end of seventh or the beginning of eighth century, when seemingly the Orissan kings lapsed into a condition of weak peacefulness for $4\frac{1}{2}$ centuries but being afraid of their powerful neighbours on the south, they dared not assert any considerable independence till the period of anarchy in Eastern Chalukya dominions which commenced about 977. *The 51 year would then refer to the Era of independence, the 254 to the original establishment of the dynasty.*" Again he stated on Pp. 31—34 thus:—"I have noted a dynasty of kings professing to belong to the Ganga family of whom a complete geneology is given for $3\frac{1}{2}$ centuries ending in 1119 A.D. with Chodaganga. They seem to be unconnected with Gangas mentioned above and yet they claim to have ruled the Kalinga country during the whole of that long period. *I can at present offer no explanation of this apparent confusion.*"

b. According to the Western Ganga Plates which belong to 11th and 12th centuries A.D. we get the following story of Gāṅga origin and date: Dhananjaya had a son called Harischandra. In his line was born Bharata. His wife, when pregnant, bathed in the Ganges and the son born was named Ganga datta. The kings who belong to his line are called Gāṅgas. In their line was born Vishnugupta. He had two sons Bhagadatta and Sridatta between whom he divided his kingdom. The former got Kalinga for his share. The latter's descendant, Padmanābha was defeated and so he sent out his sons to the South where, in Mysore they carved out their Empire called Gangavadi *in the latter half of 3rd century A.D.* From this account it is clear that before the 3rd century A.D. the Kalinga Ganga line was started.

c. Dr. Fleet while editing the plates of the Early Ganga kings threw out suggestions based on paleography or synchronism. In his article on the Parlakimidi plates of Indravarma (Vide Ind. Ant. vol. XVI), he stated as follows:—"As regards the Era in which the dates of this

inscription and the two Chicacole grants are recorded, I can do little more than repeat what I have already said, viz, that it is evidently the Gangeya Era specifically mentioned under that name but apparently only in connection with a conventional date in a grant of Devendra and another of Satya, both of which are dated in the year of the Era. I have also a grant of Devendra of 254 year of the Era. *The Epoch of the Era still remains to be determined.* But in publishing Chicacole grants I wrote it is possible that Indra of 128 year is identical with Adhirāja Indra who is mentioned in the Godavari grant of Prithvimūla as combining with other chiefs and overthrowing a certain Indrabhattāraka. This Indrabhattāraka must be the Eastern Chalukya king of that name, younger brother of Jayasimha I. (Saka 549 to 579-582) and father of Vishnu II. (579-582-591) This is the period to which all the three grants of Indra may be allotted on paleographical grounds. As already intimated the clue to the date may be found in line 10 of the grant of 128, of an eclipse of moon on full moon day of Margāsira." He then states that the lunareclipse may fall within the years, Saka 549 to 646.

d. Mr. G. Ramados B. A. in an article on "the chronology of the kings of Kalinga" in J. B. O. R. S. vol. 9, pts. III and IV, pp. 398-415 examined the several astronomical facts mentioned by Dr. Fleet and supplemented by him also and came to the conclusion that *not one of the years would stand the test* and the period suggested by Dr. Fleet is incorrect and that Indra of 128 year cannot be identified with Adhirāja of Prithvimūla's Plates.

Mr. Ramados thinks that the Era was not merely conventional but connected with an epoch making event and states that that event was Samudragupta's invasion of Kalinga in 340 A. D. as a result of which an old dynasty of Swāmidatta of Pittapur was replaced and the new Ganga dynasty was set up.

From a comparison of the letters of the Early Ganga plates with those of the Gupta plates, and from the Gupta conquest of Kalinga, and from a study of eclipses and astronomical features, he comes to the conclusion that the Gupta Era must have been adopted by the Gangas. But strangely, he does not fix up A.D. 319-320 which is the starting point of Gupta Era as the initial year of Gāṅga rule but accepts A.D. 339-340 which is the year of Samudragupta's invasion of Kalinga, as the initial year.

e. Mr. Satyanarayana Raja Guru in his article on "*Santa Bonvali Copperplate Grant of Nandavarma: A reply to Mr. Ramados Review*," published in J. A. H. R. S. vol. IV Pts. 1 & 2, pp. 9-20, criticises the views of Mr. Ramdas and states that his assumption regarding the Gangēya Era is incorrect as the astronomical data on which he relies does not satisfy the test.

Mr. Rajguru says, relying on the titles used by kings that there were five collateral branches of Ganga line that ruled over different parts of Kalinga and that the main line of Kamarnava began to rule in the last part of 7th, or the first part of 8th, century A.D. when the Era was started. In his *Phulasara copper plate. Grant of Kirttrajadeva* published in *J. A. H. R. S.*, vol. III, Pt. I pp 30-40, Mr. Rajaguru maintains the same period as the one during which the Gangeya Era was started.

My own conclusion.

One point connected with Ganga chronology is the settlement of the question whether the Early and the Later Ganga kings belonged to one and same line or not. While editing the *Cheedivalasa Plates of Devendravarma* dated 397 Ganga Era in *J. A. H. R. S.* vol. 2. Pt. 2, p. 161 f. I proved conclusively that both the lines are one and the same. Both were called *Ganga vamsa* kings. The endings of the names of the early Ganga kings and those of the first kings of the later Ganga line are similar. The seals of both sets of Plates bear common features. Both were issued from Victorious Kalinganagara. Both the lines worshipped Mahendrachala Gōkarnasvāmi only. Both were related to Kadambas. Both belonged to lunar dynasty. So both lines are one and the same. But while the Early line used Ganga Era, the later line used Saka Era. One king of the later line *MadhuKāmarnava* actually used the year 526 of Gangeya Era. (Vide C. P. No. 3, E.P. Report for 1918-1919). From the Plates of Anantavarma Vajrahasta, we get a regular Geneology and Chronolgy in Saka dates. The time of this Madhu Kāmarnava is Saka 941-959 or, A.D. 1019-1037. Granting that this king gave the grant of 526. G.E. as soon as he came to the throne, the Era would start in A.D. 493.

Now, with the aid of Paleography and Synchronism, we arrive at the same conclusion. While editing the *Jirjungi Plates of Indravarma* in *J. A. H. R. S.* vol. 3 Pt. I pp. 49-53, I stated that the king made the grant in 39 year of G.E. and so he might be the Founder of the dynasty. He alone of all the early kings is styled Trikalīngādhipati. The characters of his Plates are box headed and resemble those of the Vākatakas of 5th—6th century A.D. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Iyer, Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy, Southern Circle examined the Plates and came to the same conclusion. Hence, the year 39 will be equal to 530 A. D. nearly.

Dr. Fleet identified Indravaram of 128, and 146 years with the E. Chalukya Indrabhattaraka who lived in 666 A. D. This would make 520 A.D. the starting point of Ganga Era. He also opined that the grant of Devendravarma of 254. year on paleographical grounds must belong to 774 A.D. This would also make 520 A. D. the starting year of Gāṅga Era. Dr. Kielhorn has suggested that this Indravarma Ganga must be identified with Indrabhattaraka of Vishnukundin line and not with

Indrabhattaraka of the Eastern Chalukya line, as in the Vishnukundin plates, references are often given about their fights with Chaturdantas of the East, i.e. Ganga line. This Vishnukundin Indra died in 525 A. D. (See the chronology in my *Kalinga Desa Charitra* P. 57). And so, if Ganga Indra of 128—146 years was contemporary of Vishnukundin Indra of 505—525 A.D, we get 375 A.D. as the starting point of the Era. But I cannot accept this date as it falls in the heyday of Gupta-Vishnukundin zenith when no Era could possibly be started. So I must identify the Tri-kalingadhipati Ganga Indra of Jirjangi Plates of 39 year who refers to fights with his elephants as the Indra who defeated Vishnukundin Indra when he tried to regain his hold on the eastern region from out of the Ganga king's hand. If this identification be held good, then the 39 year would correspond to 525 A.D, or the era would begin about 490 A. D. One more strong argument in favour of this view is the fall of the Gupta Empire about 490 A.D. The Maukharis rose and started an Era of their own at that time. Similarly, the E. Gangas also got their chance after the fall of the Gupta Empire, and so, at the close of the 5th C. A.D. or, as indicated by Madhukamarnava's plates, in 493 AD, the Ganga Era was started *after, and as a result of*, the fall of the Imperial Guptas.

iii.

**Members who paid their subscriptions during the quarter
ending with 30-9-30**

<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.	<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.
Sriramamurti D.	4 0	Sankara Rao A.	4 0
Ganganna Jayanti	4 0	Venkatasivudu R.	3 4
Jaganadha Rao Sri K. V.	4 0	Sitaramiah G.	3 4
Achyuta Rao T.	2 0	Kameswara Rao Somina	4 0
Sambasiva Rao M.	4 0	Suryanarayana Rao K.	4 0
Srinivasa Raghavachari M.K.	4 0	Dhanaraju Talari	2 0
Somasundara Desikar	3 0	Iswar Dutt K.	3 2
Dunkelbørger Rev. R. M.	4 0	Krishna Rao B. V.	4 0
Sarma Sir, B. N.	3 6	Elwin D. H. I.C.S. 2 yrs.	6 0
Venkatachalam C. D. B.	4 0	Miss. Krishna Bai R. S.	4 0
Venkatarao Chilukuri	6 0	Rama Rao Kotari	3 0
Vasudeva Rao R. V.	3 4	Sundara Rao V. B.	3 0
Somasundaram P.	3 4	Ramaseshiah Choudry N. 4 yrs.	14 4
Venkatesan N. K.	4 0		
Parvateswara Sastri M.	15 0	Total	129 0
Radhakrishnan Prof. S.	3 4		

Subscribers who paid their Subscriptions during the quarter.

Arthur Probsthain	12	13	0
Do	21	4	0
Total	34	1	0

Donations received during the quarter.

Srirama Sastri D.	5	0	0
Total	5	0	0
Total receipts during the quarter.	168	1	0

**Members who paid their Subscriptions during the quarter
ending with 31—12—30**

<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.	<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.
Subbarayudu V. V.	3 4	Narasimham S. V.	2 0
Venkatapathi Raju B.	3 4	Nagaraju C.	2 0
Subbaraju P. (29—31)	6 13	Krishnamurti M.	3 0
Subba Rao Kallabandi	4 0	Appa Rao Vissa	3 8
Subba Rao Pantulu N.	4 0	Appa Rao D.	3 8
Kameswara Rao N.	4 0	Ramayya Pantulu J.	3 8
Kameswara Rao Sripada	4 0	Gangaraju Sri Mothey	3 8
Purnayya Pantulu V.	4 0	Krishna Rao Sri Mothey	3 8
Ramarao A.	4 0	Ramesam Hon. Justice Sir V.	3 8
Bapanayya S.	4 0	Venkateswarlu V. (30—32)	7 0
Krishna Rao B. V.	1 0	Ramachandra Rao B.	3 8
Venkata Kao D.	4 0	Krishna Rao Bhonsle R.	3 8
Jaganatha Gopal Rao Sree K.	4 0	Subba Rao L.	3 8
Subba Rao Rebbapragada	3 0	Iswar Dutt K.	3 8
Venkatasam N. K.	4 0	Narasinga Rao Gadi	3 8
Kameswara Sastry Bh.	4 0	Seshagiri Rao B.	3 8
Dunkelberger Rev. R. M.	4 0	Venkatarangiah M.	3 8
Sambasiva Rao M.	4 0	Narasimham Pantulu N.	3 8
Krishnaswami Iyer C. V.	4 0	Potdar Datta Waman	3 8
Venkataramiah N.	4 0	Rajaratnam K.	3 8
Atchyuta Rao T.	2 0	Anantarama Iyer P. H.	3 8
Veeraraghavachari S. E. V.		Raghavachari K.	3 8
(29—30)	3 0	Seetaramiah G.	3 8
Dubrieul G. J.	3 6	Jaganadhaswami G.	3 8
Hira Lal, Pandit	13 8	Gopalam P. V. S.	3 8
Kameswara Rao D.Ch.(29-30)	4 0	Kursheed Ali Syed	3 8
Atmaram C.	5 0	Vikrama Deva Varma, Raja	3 8
Sambasiva Rao D, (29—30)	3 0	Subbarayudu M.	3 8
Sriramamurti D.	4 0	Herras Henry Rev.	3 8
Veerabhadriah Sri Hota	4 0	Joganna U.	3 8
Somayazulu G. G.	4 0	Bhujanga Rao T.	3 8
Krishna Rao Nalam	4 0	Krishna Bai R. S.	3 8
Subba Rao V. (29—30)	4 0	Venkatanarayana T.	3 8
Krishnabrahman V. (29—30)	3 0	Sambasiva Rao C.	3 8
Bhanumurti C.	3 0	Narayana Rao C.	3 0
Venkatachalam Pantulu C.	4 0	Satyanarayana Rao P.	10 0
Srinivasa Raghavachari	2 0	Jogi Jaganatha Raju Sri V. S.	3 8

<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.	<i>Messrs.</i>	Rs. as.
Venkatappiah K.	3 8	Setaramiah Somanchi	3 8
Gopala Reddi B.	3 8	Lakshminarayan Harichandan	
Gopalakrishna Sarma R.	3 8	Jaga Deb Raja Bahadur	3 8
Brierley W. B.	3 8	Reddi C. R.	3 8
Sriram V.	3 8	Hirde Narayan	3 8
Ramamurti K.	3 8	Abdul Ali A. F. M.	3 8
Radhakrishnan S.	3 8	Nageswara Rao Gadi	3 8
Ramadas G.	3 8	Avadhani V.V.S.	3 8
Popley Rev. H. A.	3 8	Sanjiva Rao M.	3 8
Hume Sastri B.	3 8	Makody Govind Balwant	3 8
Subrahmanya Iyer K. V.	3 8	Sambasiva Rao S. V.	3 8
Goedke Rev. Hurry	3 8	Radhakrishnamurti Hari	3 8
Brown J. B. I.C.S. C.I.E.	3 8	Trivikrama Rao D.	3 8
Narasimham Pratha	3 8	Ramaseshiah Chowdry N.	3 8
Rao, P. S. I.C.S.	3 8	Rama Rao K.	3 8
Bhandarkar D. R.	3 8	Venkatapathi Raju N.	3 8
Venkatramiah D.	3 8	Narasimham Dh.	3 8
Krishnaswami Rao C.	3 8	Ramamurti Pantulu G.	3 8
Vedananda Krishnaswami	3 8	Sitapati G. V.	3 8
Sitaramiah Ch.	3 8	Ramakrishniah K.	3 8
Perraju K.	3 8	Venkataramaraju R.	3 8
Seshadri P.	3 8	Srinivasachari C. S.	3 8
Gangooly T.	3 8	Somasundara Desikar	3 8
Hanumantacharya K.	3 8	Sreehari Pantulu G.	3 8
Dakshinamurti P.	3 8	Ramachandra Rao A. S.	3 8
Bhuyan Surya Kumar	3 8	Satyanarayana Rajaguru	3 8
Venkatarama Iyer A. V.	3 8	Prakasa Rao D. V. S.	3 8
Lakshminarayana Sastri Bh.	3 8	Venkataratnam T.	3 8
Jogiah Pantulu V. V.	3 8	Narasimharaju D. L.	3 8
Hanumanta Rao S.	3 8	Bhagavantam Gupta T.	3 8
Ramakrishna Sastri B.	3 8		
Subrahmanya Sastri S.	7 0		
Gopinath Harichandan Jaga			490 15
Deb Raja Bahadur	3 8		

Subscribers who paid their Subscriptions during the quarter.

The Hindu Reading Room. Vizagapatam (Vol. IV)	6 4
The Campbell Library Do.	6 4
The Hindustan Academy, Allahabad	13 0
The Madras University Library, Madras	6 0

The Govt. Sanskrit College, Benares (Vols. 2 & 5)	12	8
The Rajah's College, Parlakimedi (Vols 4 & 5)	13	0
The Andhra University, Waltair	6	0
The Andhra Christian College, Guntur	6	8
The Stall Training School for Mistresses, Guntur	6	8
The Adyar Library, Madras	6	8*
The Literary Association, Coconada	6	8
The P. R. College, Coconada	6	8
Commissioner, Ajmere-Merwara	6	0
The Noble College, Masulipatam	6	9
The Archaeological Supdt. Eastren Circle, Calcutta	6	8
The Govt. Museum (Archl. Section) Calcutta	6	8
The Provincial Museum, Lucknow	6	8
The Imperial Library, Calcutta	6	8
The Dacca University, Dacca	6	0
The Secretariat Library Fort St. George Madras	6	0
The Maharajah's Office, Pithapuram	6	0
Total	151	8

JOURNAL OF THE ANDHRA HISTORICAL RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Volume V]

April 1931.

[Part 4.

HISTORY OF RAJAHMUNDRY.

BHAVARAJ V. KRISHNARAO, B.A., B.L.

(Continued from p. 112 of vol. III. above)

To resume the thread of history. The reign of Rājarāja has been ignorantly supposed to be a peaceful one by some scholars, and that he was but a weak prince, being content with the position of a vassal of the Chōla emperor, and as such enjoyed comparative peace and immunity from the danger of foreign invasion for a full reign of forty and odd years.¹ These historians consider his reign to be rather uneventful in the main, but for the composition of the *Āndhra Mahābhārata* by Nanniya Bhaṭṭa, the poet laureate of Rājarāja. The work is certainly the first extant literary composition in the Telugu language and was written under the patronage and inspiration of that illustrious king.

Let us examine the truth of this assumption. Nanniya's reference to his patron in the Introduction to his *Mahābhārata*, as a valourous and powerful king, who won victories in several battles and obtained the throne has been taken by some historians till now, probably out of ignorance, to be a mere stretch of poetic imagination. The existence of a powerful neighbour in the south in the king of the Chōlas, and the supposed assistance which the latter gave to Śaktivarman I. and his brother Vimalāditya in regaining the throne in or about A. D. 999, and the eventual alliance by marriage between Vimalāditya and Kundava, sister of Rājendra Chōla alias Gaṅgaikondaṇ, led to this assumption that the kings of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty were satisfied to remain as subordinates and appanages of the Chōlas. But nothing is farther from truth than this as some recently discovered copper plate records of the dynasty go to show.

1 Prof S. K. Aiyengar's *Ancient India*.

It now appears that the erroneous view propounded by the southern school of historians led by the late Rai Bahadur V. Venkayya,² is nothing but gratuitous and untrue. We know Vimalāditya married two wives, Kundava, daughter of the Chōḷa king Rājārāja the great, and Mēdāmbā, another Chōḷa princess. By Kundavāmbā, Vimalāditya had a son Rājārāja and by Mēdāmbā a younger son named Vijayāditya, who is known to history as Vijayāditya, VII. *alias* Chālukya Bhīma IV. On the death of Vimalāditya in A. D. 1022, his eldest son Rājārāja, succeeded to the throne; and his accession took place on Thursday, the 2nd *tithi* of the dark fortnight of the month Bhādrapada, S. S. 944, corresponding to 16th August, A. D. 1022.³ For sometime Rājārāja appears to have reigned in peace; but about the eighth year of his reign troubles arose, on account of the revolt of his younger brother Vijayāditya VII. who was seized with the ambition to reign in Vēṅgi. Vijayāditya at once rallied to his banner some of the insurgent elements in the kingdom, and with their help and probably also taking advantage of the temporary absence of Rājārāja from the country, crowned himself king of Vēṅgi. His coronation is stated to have taken place in the eighth year of the reign of Rājārāja, on Thursday, the 5th *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the month of Karkata (luni-solar month may be *Āshāḍha* or *Śrāvaṇa*) in S.S. 952, corresponding to Thursday, 9th July A. D. 1030.⁴ Though he crowned himself king, the usurpation of the kingdom did not become complete till four years later, when he says he drove out his half-brother Rājārāja from the country.⁵ These four years of protracted warfare, therefore, were filled with severe fighting in the country, victory swaying at one time this side and another, on the other, between the two brothers. As a result of this devastating warfare the country appears to have been divided and those who were responsible for this revolt and usurpation by Vijayāditya must have been immensely benefited by the conditions in Vēṅgi. Vijayāditya assumed the title of Chālukya Bhīma IV. on his accession to the throne, though he was known to his contemporaries by his familiar name Vijayāditya VII.

In this attempt of Vijayāditya VII., to gain the throne of his father he appears to have been greatly assisted by the western Chālukya king Sōmēśvara I. whose vassal he was. Vijayāditya on account, of his association with the sons of Sōmēśvara I., in the latter's campaigns in the south against the Chōḷas and the Mysore territory led the historians to believe that he was the fourth son of Sōmēśvara I.⁶ Notable

2 Annual Report on South India, Epigraphy 1900 p 18 & *Ep. and.* vol, p 350

3 Korumalli Plates of Rajaraja, Ind. Ant. vol. XI p. 48

4 Pamulavaka grant of vijayaditya VII. See above vol. II. p 277

5 *Ibid*; and Telugu Academy plates of Saktivarman II., See above vol. IV p 33

6 Dynasties of the Canarese District p. 440

among the chiefs and *mandalēśvaras* of Vēṅgi who raised the banner of revolt under the leadership of Vijayāditya are Bhīma Bhūpa and his son Chāmarāja the ornament of the *Nāga kula*, called the lord of Mēgha giri.⁷ Bhīma Bhūpa who was the trusted soldier of Vijayāditya VII., at the time of the latter's coronation, received as a reward for his faithful and heroic services Kompolomgu and twelve other small villages as a fief, for having taken great pains in his cause. Bhīma Bhūpa is called Malaya Bhāskara, and this title seem to indicate that he was lord of the hill region of Vēṅgīdeśa, comprising the hilly tracts of the East Gōdāvari and Vizagapatam districts, more probably of the latter though it has not become possible to identify the Mēgha-giri with any hill of repute in those parts.

It does not appear that Vijayāditya VII. reigned long peacefully in Vēṅgi. Even the first four years of his rule were filled with internecine warfare and Vijayāditya's authority in the country does not seem to have been supreme between A. D. 1030 and 1034. The fact that though Vijayāditya VII. crowned himself king in July 1030, he could not become the master of the kingdom till four years later, when he drove out his brother from the country, shows that Rājarāja had still some hold on the people in some part of the kingdom and that the country was divided between the brothers. It cannot be said how long Vijayāditya VII. reigned after A. D. 1034; but it seems certain that he did not hold the country long for himself. His rule might not have extended for over a year or two and, he was probably attacked, defeated and exiled in disgrace once more into the west. The disgraceful revolt and treachery of Vijayāditya and his short rule have been rightly ignored both by Rājarāja-Vijayāditya and his son Śaktivarman II. in their grants issued some years later.⁸ Nanniya Bhaṭṭa naively refers to the unsuccessful and temporary revolt of Rājarāja's brother (*dāyāḍa*) in the *Andhra Mahābhārata*, and extols his patron as one who regained the kingdom through his own prowess and victories obtained in several battles with his enemies.⁹

Vijayāditya VII., after this episode fled to the court of the Western Chālukyas, who were then preparing for a protracted struggle with the Chōḷas of the south, for the expansion of their empire. And for this reason Vijayāditya VII. readily found shelter from his erstwhile ally and probably overlord, Āhavamalla Sōmēśvara I. who was only too delighted to have once more a discontented prince of Vēṅgi as his vassal. The Chōḷas bore no love for Western Chālukyas; and the Western Chālukyas and the Chōḷas together were hostile towards the Eastern Chālukyas, and eagerly waited for an opportunity to annex it to their respective empires.

7 Pamulavaka grant of Vijayaditya VII see above vol. p 277

8 The Pamulavaka plates of Vijayaditya VII and the Telugu Academy plates of Saktivarman II referred to above

9 Adiparvam

Rājarāja must have had a very hard time in quelling the insurgent elements in the country before he restored peace and order. About this time apparently his son Prince Rājendra Chōḍa was born to his queen Ammagadēvi. This prince Rājendra became afterwards famous in the history of South India as Kulōttunga Chōḍa Dēva I. the founder of the *Chālukya-Chōḷa* line of the throne of Kāñchī. History does not speak of any son by the name of Sārangadhara to our Rājarāja of Rājamahēndravaram though curiously enough the tradition has become tied down to this unfortunate king and town.

The last years of Rājarāja seem to have become again disturbed. By this time the Western Chālukyas and the Chōḷas were constantly at war with each other on their frontiers, struggling to extend the borders of their empires beyond the Tungabhadra. For this purpose the Western Chālukyan prince Vikramāditya, afterwards the Vikramāditya VI., the founder of the Chālukya Vikrama Era was appointed as viceroy of the southern provinces with his capital somewhere on the banks of the Tungabhadra. He carried on his incursions into the farther south and threatened to destroy the Chōḷa power at one time. But the succession of powerful kings on the Chōḷa throne from Rājendra Chōḷa to Virarājendradēva prevented any such disaster. About the year A. D. 1060, Someswara I. invaded the Chōḷa dominions, penetrated as far as the Chōḷa capital Kāñchīpura, stormed the city, and drove the ruler Rājendradēva into the jungles. This event seems to have taken place shortly before 20th January A. D. 1060, according to an inscription found at Sudi in Dhārwar district, which records a grant to the temple by Sōmēśvara I. on his return from his conquest of the southern countries and of the Chōḷas.¹⁰ About this time too, the Eastern Chālukya king Rājarāja had experienced some trouble on the northern frontiers of the kingdom in the direction of Chakrakūṭa maṇḍala (modern Bastar state and the district of Chhattisgarh in the Central Provinces), which appears at this time to have been a feudatory kingdom under the Eastern Chālukyas. This part of the northern provinces had for a long time known as Trikalīnga, and was included in the Eastern Chālukyan dominions since the days of Vijayāditya III. Yaśaḥkarnadēva, lord of Chēdi, invaded Vēṅgi, apparently with the object of annexing the province of Trikalīnga, to his kingdom.¹² Yaśaḥkarnadēva's

10 I have avoided discussion on this point here, as space forbids it. If the prince is taken to have been born at this period i.e. A.D. 1034—35 or 1035—36 he would be just 27 years of age at the time of his father's death and 32 years on the date of his accession to the Chōḷa throne and an octogenarian at the time of his death.

11 *Dynasties of the Canarese Districts* page 441

12 Jubbulpore plates of Yaśaḥkarnadēva *Ep. Ind.* vol. II p. 1. See also *Ep. Ind.* vol. XII p. 205

invasion was probably due to the influence of the Western Chālukya king Sōmēśvara, or more probably was under the inducement of Vijayāditya VII. who had begun again to cast evil glances on his ancestral kingdom aided by his master and ally Sōmēśvara Āhavamalla I. Whatever might be the causes, there was war in Chakrakūṭa maṇḍala and Wairgarh (Vāirāgāram of the Kulōttunga Chōḷa I's inscriptions) and Rājarāja and his son hastened towards the north to quell the rebellion.

The absence of Rājarāja and his son from the kingdom at a time when the arms of the Western Chālukyas were successful in the south gave an opportunity to Vijayāditya VII. to invade Vēṅgi and occupy the capital. It is certain that he was backed up by the Western Chālukyas and the kingdom of Rājamahēndravaram fell an easy prey to his invasion. The story of the invasion is thus briefly told. A grant of his son Saktivarman II.,¹³ states that Vijayāditya VII. conquered the kingdom during the absence of Rājarāja. This might be in A. D. 1061—62 or thereabouts. In this campaign Vijayāditya was greatly assisted by a nobleman Aḍapa Appana who was rewarded with a fief on the occasion of the coronation of Saktivarman II. in A.D. 1064. Vijayāditya VII. conquered the kingdom, but out of the great love he bore for his son, rather his only son, crowned him king and probably went back afterwards to his Western Chālukya viceroyalty. The news of Vijayāditya's invasion of Vēṅgi did not turn away Rājarāja or his son Rājendra Chōḍa from the fields of Chakrakūṭa or Vairagaram but it might be that Rājarāja who had become old by this time perished on the battle-field.¹³ The story current in tradition in the country today that there was an invasion of the country by some enemies and consequently confusion and chaos, and that Rājarāja lost his life in the tumult that arose, in those troublous times when the whole country was immersed in grief and that Nanniya too died leaving his *Mahā-bhārata* unfinished, seems to contain some truth. It is a fact that Nanniya's work is incomplete, only three parvas having been written by him.

These events roughly took place about A.D. 1062—63. The death of Rājarāja even does not seem to have turned away prince Rājendra Chōḍa from his resolve to reduce the insurgent vassals in the north. Though his country was occupied by his treacherous uncle a second time, and that, at a time when he and his father were away, the youthful prince did not leave the task of reducing his insolent enemy in the first place. Rājendra Chōḍa remained in Chakrakūṭa till he destroyed the power of Dhāraavarshadēva, lord of the Chakrakūṭamaṇḍala and storming the impregnable citadel of Wairgarh (Vāirāgāram) and capturing herds of the enemy's elephants which he carried home in great pomp, with pride. The

¹³ The Teiugu Academy plates of Saktivarman II see above vol. IV p. 33

storming of the fort of Wairgarh and capturing the elephants of that king were regarded by Rājendra Chōḍa as marvellous feats of heroism and military skill, and that is the chief reason why these exploits find mention in almost all his records. Chakrakūṭamaṇḍala and Wairgarh were reduced and Trikalīṅga, the kingdom of Dhāraavarshadēva, was probably re-annexed to the kingdom of the Eastern Chālukyas.

Immediately on his return from his wars in the north, Rājendra seems to have attacked his cousin Saktivarman II. who was reigning in Rājamahēndravaram, defeated and slew him in the battle that ensued. This event might be assigned to A.D. 1065. Vijayāditya VII. who was absent at this time from the capital and the country, returned and opposed Rājendra Chōḍa. Vijayāditya VII. bemoans the loss of his only son very keenly as he compares his tragic death on the battle field to that of the epic hero Abhimanyu, who like prince Saktivarman II. died on the battle-field at a moment when he was hemmed in by his own hostile kinsmen. Rājendra Chōḍa did not, for some reason which is not possible to divine now, —might be that he was deeply moved with the grief of the old uncle or that the events in the south at the Chōḷa capital compelled him to change his plans at the last moment,—pursue hostilities with his uncle: he quickly reconciled himself to his bereaved uncle and allowed him to reign in Vēṅgi, and himself set out to the Chōḷa kingdom which was then without a ruler on account of the unexpected death of Vira Rājendradēva. Vijayāditya VII. remained in Rājamahēndravaram and reigned till his death in A. D. 1076. Practically, he is the last of the Eastern Chālukyas that ruled in Vēṅgi as an independent sovereign, for from the days of the accession of Rājendra Chōḍa to the throne as Kulottunga Chōḷadēva I., the Chālukya line ceased to be called as such but as Chōḷa-Chālukya in all the records of the dynasty.

The death of Rājendradēva suddenly on battle field, in or about A.D. 1061—62, without leaving any male issue was an occasion to intriguing princes to cast ambitious glances at the coveted throne. Prince Rājendra Chōḍa of Rājamahēndravaram had married Madhurāntaki daughter of king Rājendradēva; and he was also the grandson (daughter's son) of prince Rājendra Chōḷa I. (alias Gaṅgaikondan); and as such he had a greater and stronger claim to succeed his father-in-law. It might be with the object and perhaps with an inward certainty of his succession to the Chōḷa throne, this ambitious prince entered into cordial terms with his erstwhile enemy, his old uncle and left him in charge of Vēṅgi. This posture which is at once statesmanlike and noble had left for our Rājendra Chōḍa a kindly and contended ally on the north, who would no longer be a source of anxiety and worry, always plotting to overthrow him by joining his enemies, and impeding his progress. Vijayāditya VII. who had grown

old and vexed with himself and his fortunes was only too content to be on the side of his generous nephew and therefore remained faithful and loyal to him. Fifteen years after this event, Rājendra Chōḍa as Kulottunga refer to this act of his own generosity and statemanship on the occasion of anointing his son Vīra Chōḍa to the viceroyalty of Vēṅgi, in succession to his uncle. Vijayāditya VII., reigned in Vēṅgi for fifteen years between A.D. 1062 and 1076. The earlier half of his reign does not appear to have been peaceful on account of continued wars and invasions of the Chōḷa king Vīrarājendra I. to which we shall presently turn.

Prince Rājendra Chōḍa moved fast towards the south, the Chōḷa capital; but the events in the Chōḷa country, unfortunately moved faster for him. Vīrarājendra I. a powerful and younger brother of Rājendradēva the last king, seized the throne and with a large army behind him proclaimed himself king on the Chōḷa kingdom, before Rājendra Chōḍa could arrive on the scene. Rājendra had thus lost both the ancestral throne and the kingdom of his maternal grandfather and uncle to which he was entitled by right to succeed. Vīrarājendra became king in A.D. 1062 (*circa*) and for full seven years, the period of his reign, successfully kept the ambitious prince Rājendra, off his path. Rājendra, seems to have lived in exile during this period keeping eye on the Chōḷa throne waiting for an opportunity. History does not tell us how and where he spent his time during this period. We do not hear of him in Vēṅgi.

We need not pause here to go into the details of the reign of Vīrarājendra I. for our purposes, but confine our narrative to the discussion of his foreign policy, especially towards the kings of Rājamahēndravaram. Vijayāditya VII. as we had already mentioned above, remained loyal to his nephew Rājendra Chōḍa and friendly with his erstwhile overlord the Western Chālukya king Someswara I. Vīrarājendra was on the one hand pursuing a most aggressive policy towards the Eastern Chālukyas in Vēṅgi, because he wanted to annex the country to his Chōḷa empire. He on more than one occasion declared that it was his avowed intention to reduce Vēṅgi to subjection as it was in accordance with the vow taken by his elder brother who died without accomplishing it. We do not however, know of any vow having been taken by either Rājendra Chōḷa I or his brother Rājendradēva, as they all remained loving relatives of Vimalāditya and Rājarāja. Whatever might be the truth of the above statement, Vīrarājendra seems to have carried on a most aggressive foreign policy towards Vēṅgi, for he had in Vēṅgi a prince who was his rival to the Chōḷa throne and another in his uncle his strong ally. As a result of this policy, Vīrarājendra I. on two occasions invaded Vēṅgi: on the last occasion he actually drove away Vijayāditya VII and occupied the capital, though it was only for a short time.

The first invasion of Virarājendra¹⁴ was in the second or third year of his reign which might fall in A.D. 1063-34. By this time Sōmēśvara I. had not died and he was still a close ally of the king of Vēṅgi Vikramāditya, the younger son of Sōmēśvara I. and ruler of the territories lying on either side of the Tungabhadra sent a large irresistible and powerful army under the command of *Mahālinḍanājaka* Chāmuṇḍarāja of Banvasi, to help Vijayāditya VII. in Vēṅgiṇāḍu. Virarājendra attacked and defeated the Western Chālukyan army; Chāmuṇḍarāja himself was killed on the field, his only daughter, beautiful Nāgalādēvī, wife of Irugavan, who resembled a peacock, was most brutally insulted by her nose being chopped off. Vijayāditya VII. proceeded towards Virarājendra and gave him battle. In this engagement, Virarājendra claims to have killed the lord of Pottapi, and a younger brother of Jananātha of Dhārā both vassals of the king of Vēṅgi.¹⁵ Vijayāditya was only temporarily subdued, but before Virarājendra could proceed further, war seems to have again broken out on the western Chālukyan frontiers,¹⁶

The war with the Western Chālukyan prince Vikramāditya VI. proved a disaster to Virarājendra; and about or prior to the 5th year of his reign he entered into an alliance with Vikramāditya VI.¹⁷ and as a result of this alliance gave his only daughter in marriage to Vikramāditya. Immediately after this alliance was sealed, Virarājendra undertook an expedition into Vēṅgi for causes not specifically mentioned. The expedition was undertaken probably to complete the conquest of Vengi which was left unfinished two years ago. Vijayāditya VII. assembled his forces and marched out to meet the enemy. The battle took place near the city of Vijayavāḍa close to the river Krishna. But Virarājendra defeated the large army of Vijayāditya who fled for safety. Having then moved his camp Virarājendra is said to have declared, "we shall not return without regaining the country of Vēṅgi which we had formerly subdued. You, the lord of Vēṅgi who are strong come and defend it if you are able."¹⁸ At this time Vijayāditya's army was commanded by *Miṇḍasēnapati* Jananāthanājaka, lord of Dhārā, *Dindinayāḍu* Rājunayya whose strong elephants trumpeted in herd and the valiant Mupparasu."¹⁹ Virarājendra pursued vanquished army, Vijayāditya fleeing ahead of it for his life. Rājendrachōḍa does not appear to have been with his uncle on this occasion for there is no mention of him at all in all the inscriptions of Virarājendra. The Chōla king then crossed the Gōḍāvari, captured

14 *S. I. I.* vol. III part I p. 31.

15 *Ibid*

17 Bilhana's *Vikramankadevācharita*, & *Ind. Ant.* vol V p. 318

18 *S. I. I.* vol. III part I p. 64

16 *Ibid.*

19 *Ibid.*

Rājamahēndravaram and proceeded into Kalinga, despatched an army as far as Chakrakūṭam and expelled Dēvanātha and other chiefs from it.²⁰ Vijayāditya in the first place appears to have fled to the court of Rājarāja, king of Kalinga and from thence to Chakrakūṭa, probably the stronghold of Rājendra Chōḍa. He is said to have taken refuge at this time, unable to carry on the fight any longer, at the feet of Virarājendra after this disgraceful flight, but there seems to be nevertheless no small exaggeration in it. We have a statement in a grant²¹ of Anantavarman *alias* Chōḍa Ganga, king of Kalinga that his father Rājarāja rendered help to Vijayāditya and "rescued him from sinking into an ocean of troubles in the west like the sun, on account of the invasion of his country by the Chōḷas." This statement is inconsistent with the boastful expressions in Virarājendra's own grants, and is certainly therefore more trustworthy in view of Virarājendra's attitude towards Vēṅgi from the beginning. Virarājendra was no doubt in occupation of the county for a short time, but Vijayāditya VII. was reinstated on the throne through the timely assistance rendered by Rājarāja of Kalinga. An inscription of Padmāvatī wife of Baṇapati,²² the commander-in-chief of the army of the king of Kalinga found at Dākshārāma puts the fact of Virarājendra's boast beyond all doubt. The Dīrghāsī inscription of Baṇapati²³ also supports the above view. Virarājendra was defeated by the combined forces of the king of Kalinga and Vēṅgi, and compelled to return to his capital, Gangaikōṇḍa Chōḷapuram. Virarājendra in spite of his defeat seems to have carried away a large booty and valuable treasures to his capital which he displayed before an admiring crowd of his commanders, ministers, vassals and people. He had become old now by this time, and an account of his successive reverses could not prosecute his cherished object of annexing Vēṅgi; and shortly afterwards died early in 1070 A. D.

The death of Virarājendra removed all the enemies of Vēṅgi, and Vijayāditya restored once more peace and prosperity. Vijayāditya ruled in peace till a very ripe old age and died about A. D. 1076 and then the kingdom of Rājamahēndravaram passed into the hands of Rājendra Chōḍa who had now become the emperor of the Chōḷas under the proud title of Kutōttunga Chōḷa Dēva. I.

Let us turn to prince Rājendra and trace the events of his early career since the death of his uncle Virarājendra. Virarājendra's death gave him once more another opportunity to turn his arms against any rival claimant to the Chōḷa throne."²⁴ The followers of Virarājendra at

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Second set of Korni copper plate grant of Anantavarman J.A.H.R.S. vol I

²² S.I.I., vol. IV No.

²³ Ep. Ind. vol. IV p. 314,

once put Adhirājendra on the throne of Gangaikonda Chōlapuram but the popular party led by the supporters of Rājendra Chōḍa, appears to have had the better of the situation. Rājendra Chōḍa who seems to have captured the heart of the people in the capital and in the country, and who had a large support from the royal grandmother the queen of Gangaikonda, who brought him up as her son, succeeded in the struggle though he had a hard time in putting the rival claimants out of his way effectively. Hearing this news, Vikramāditya VI., hastened to the Chōḷa capital and after temporarily putting down the insurrection, placed his youthful brother-in-law on the throne and left the place shortly afterwards. As soon as Vikramāditya crossed the frontiers of Chōḷa country, Rājendra entered the city and with the help of the popular party put himself at the head of the revolution, killed Adhirājendra and proclaimed himself the undisputed master of the Chōḷa empire. It is doubted whether Adhirājendra was killed by Rājendra Chōḍa, by some historians, but the circumstances under which the event took place throws a cloud on the character of Rājendra. As a political murder it had certainly its own justification and might be well a fact. Rājendra Chōḍa, on the occasion of his accession to the throne of the Chōḷas assumed the significant name Kulōttunga Chōḷa Dēva I., and united in him the lineage of the Chālukyas and the Chōḷas. He thus founded a new line on the throne of Chōḷas, called the *Chālukya-Chōḷa* dynasty. The Eastern Chālukya line founded by Kubja Vishnuvardhana I. in or about A.D. 615 C, thus came an end in A.D. 1076 with the death of Vijayāditya VII. as such, and the last prince of the dynasty was Rājendra Chōḍa himself. Kulōttunga Chōḷa never came to Rājamahēndravaram or to Vēṅgi dēśa to reign: he was content to govern this ancestral country of his through his sons whom he sent out from time to time as his viceroys and later on raised one of his own trusted noblemen, Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Velananti Chōḍa son of Gonka I. as the viceroy of Vēṅgi after formally adopting him as his own son and anointing him with his own name.

On the death of Vijayāditya VII., Kulōttunga Chōḷa Deva I. assumed the rulership of Vēṅgīdēśa directly, and sent out his eldest son Rājarāja *alias* Mummaḍichōḍa to Rājamahēndravaram to govern the country as his viceroy.²⁵ But this prince, it is said did not remain long in vēṅgi in separation from his parents and so requested his father to permit him to return to Kāñchi, after reigning only for one year. In the following year, A.D. 1078 Kulōttunga sent his younger perhaps the third son, prince Vīra Chōḍa who was a valourous and powerful youth to Vēṅgi. This prince crowned himself at a town called Jananāthapura which is

24 Anni Rep. and South Ind. Ep. for 1899 p. 14 para 51

25 Chellur grant of Virachoda S.I.I. vol. I p. 49

not capable of identification, and ruled for six years till A. D. 1084.²⁶ About this time a war with the Pandyas broke out in the south and Vīra Chōḍa was called away to carry on the expedition against the Pandya country.²⁷ In this expedition Vira Chōḍa was followed by the Velaṇāṇṭi Chief Vedula to the south who fought victoriously by the side of his overlord.²⁸ During the absence of Vīra Chōḍa, Vēṅgi was governed by Chōḍaganga *alias* Rājarāa, the eldest son of Rājarāja, from A. D. 1084 to 1088—9.²⁹ This prince like his brother Vīra Chōḍa was a vaishnava unlike his father Kulōttunga Chōḍa I., In A. D. 1086, Vīra Chōḍa returned to Vēṅgi, apparently after successfully bringing to a close the war against the Pandyas and bringing them to subjection and servitude. Vīra Chōḍa continued to rule in Vēṅgi till A. D. 1092; and sometime afterwards, he seems to have died in the war with the lords of Chakrakūta and Kalinga that ensued about that time.

The events of this period may be briefly narrated thus. Vēṅgi maṇḍala was invaded by Jagadēkabhūshana Sōmēśvaradēva, lord of Chakrakuta maṇḍala, during the last days of Vīra Chōḍa's period of second viceroyalty in Vēṅgi. Though the causes for this invasion are not apparent, it might be due to the probable hostilities between the lords of Chakrakuta maṇḍala and Andhra country from the last days of Rājarāja (1062—1063). We have seen already how *Yuvarāja* Rajendra Chōḍa, made an incursion into the provinces of Chakrakuta and Vāyirāgāram (Vajrakota i.e. Waingarh) and after subduing the rulers of the countries carried away great plunder and large herds of elephants. During this invasion apparently Dhāravarshadēva, lord of Chakrakūta, lost his life, and was succeeded by his son Sōmēśvaradēva the most powerful of the rulers of his family. Perhaps it is on account of this hereditary hostility towards Vēṅgi maṇḍala, that Sōmēśvaradēva appears to have invaded Vēṅgi during the viceroyalty of prince Vīra Chōḍa, and actually burnt the capital of the kingdom, which was at that time called Jananāthapur^e. This event may possibly be fixed about A. D. 1092—93 when the period of Vīrachōḍa's second viceroyalty came to a close, and he was never afterwards heard of again.

Chakrakūta which were till then a tributary kingdoms under Kulōttunga I. appears to have rebelled and declared independence with the assistance of the Kalachuris of Chēdi. Vira Chōḍa who appears at

²⁶ *Ibid* and Pithapuram Ins. of Prithvisvara *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV p 32

²⁷ *Ibid*

²⁸ Pithapuram Ins. of Vrithirisvara *Ep. Ind* vol IV p 32

²⁹ Teki plates of Rājarāja Chodaganga *Ep. Ind.* vol. VI p. 332

this time in the Kalinga capital³⁰ on the Vamśadhāra probably died afterwards, Kulōttunga on hearing the news set out on his second expedition against Kalinga and reduced the kingdom to subjection a second time. The Kalingatṭuparaṇi³¹ and the inscriptions of the time³² of Kulōttunga Chōḷa I. fix the date of this second expedition in A. D. 1095—96, which falls in the twenty-sixth year of his reign. This expedition falls in the reign of the reign of Anantvaraman alias Chōḷa Gangā, A. D. 1078—1142 and is described in great detail in the *Kalingatṭuparaṇi*.

30 *S.I.I.*, vol VI No. 1005

31 *Ind Ant* vol XIV p 329

32 *Annl Rept S I Epigraphy* for 1901 p 8

(To be continued)

KAPAYA NAYAKA

M. SOMASEKHARA ŚARMA.

INTRODUCTION.

The condition of the Andhra Country after the destruction of the Kākatiya kingdom of Warangal is thus described in the Kaluvachēru grant¹ of Anitalli :

तस्मिन् प्रतापरुद्रे स्वस्थानं स्वेच्छयैव यातवति
अथ सा भू र्यवनमयी जातै ब्रह्मो महामयो महिमा ॥
वरहव द्वारिधि वारिमन्नां धारा मशोषां यवनोदरस्था
समुद्धरन् प्रोलयनायकेन्द्र स्ततः प्रतिष्ठापयति स्म तद्वत् ॥
स्वर्गातिर्या प्रोलयभूमिपाले विश्वेश्वराज्ञा मधिगम्य गत्वा
अपालय त्कायन्तान्धकन्त्रः तदिदं (तदोय) राज्यं तरणिप्रतापः ॥
अथ पंचोत्तर सप्तति नायक संसेव्यमान पदपद्मः
कापावनीश्वरः श्री विश्वेश्वरकरुणया क्षिति मरक्षत् ॥
तुप्रणै ये समाक्रान्ता स्ते चान्यं कापभूभुजा
अग्रहाराः पुनर्दत्ता भूयो भुव मभूषयन् ॥
विश्वेश्वराय विविधां प्रविधाय सेवां याते विभौ दिवि च तत्पदसेवनाय
तै नार्यकै रस्वनगरा ण्यजिगम्य सर्वै स्संरक्षिता गताविरोध कथं स्वदेशाः .

"After Pratāparudra departed from this world Prōlaya nāyaka reconquered all the territory, which was in possession of the Muhammaddans. When Prōlaya died, the government of the country passed into the hands of Kāpayanāyaka, who was served by Seventy Five chiefs. He not only restored to the brahmans their *agrahāras* which were confiscated by the Mussalmans, but granted to them several villages afresh. After his death, the seventy five chiefs, who had been his subordinates, declared independence, each in his own principality. King Vēma was one of them."

The political condition of the country after the fall of the Kākatiyas and the part played by Prōlaya and Kāpaya nāyakas are described

only in the Kaluvachēru copper-plate grant. It is however silent about the manner in which Prōlaya and Kāpaya were related to each other. I shall make an attempt, in this paper to discover the identity of these chiefs, who rescued the country from the clutches of the Muhammadans and the nature of their relationship.

II

For our purpose we have to depend entirely upon the inscriptions of these chiefs, which are found exclusively in the Telugu country along the east coast. They are :

- i. The Dōnepūṇḍi grant² of Koppula Nāmaya nāyaka—*Śaka* 1259
- ii. The Gaṇapēśvaraṁ inscription³ of Kāpaya nāyaka—*Śaka* 1268.
- iii. The Pillalamarri inscription⁴ of Kāpaya nāyaka—*Śaka* 1275.
- iv. The Siṁhāchalaṁ inscription⁵ of Koppula Kāpaya nāyaka—*Śaka* 1282
- v. The Siṁhāchalaṁ inscription⁶ of Koppula Nāmaya nāyaka—*Śaka* 1291
- vi. The Siṁhachalaṁ inscription⁷ of Muppamadēvī—*Śaka* 1310.

With the exception of the first which is a copper-plate grant, all are stone inscriptions.

Nāmaya nāyaka of No. 1 in the above list, ruled a portion Āndhra *maṇḍala* extending from the river Gōdāvari to Kalinga, with the city of Pithāpura as his capital. He was the son of Prōlaya nāyaka; his wife was Chōḍamāmbā, and was a grand son of Koppula Kāpaya nāyaka. He bore the titles of "*Pagamechchugāṇḍa*" and "*Pratyardhigarva nirvāpaṇa*"

The first inscription of this chief bearing the name of Kāpaya nāyaka is found at Gaṇapēśvaraṁ in Dīvi taluk of the Krishna district. It records some gift made to god Gaṇapēśvara by a certain "Tumbiḍi Uppalapumbrōlu *leṇka*", a servant of Kāpaya nāyaka for the merit of his lord. It is said in this grant that Kāpaya had the title *Arumanangaṇṭi puravardhīśvara*. "Supreme Lord of the city of Arumannagatipura, the best of cities".

There is another inscription which refers to Kāpaya nāyaka, as *Andhradeśādhiśvara* and *Arumanangaṇṭipuravardhīśvara*. (Lord of

² *Ep. Ind.* vol. IV, p. 356.

³ *S.I.I.* vol. IV, No. 950.

⁴ '*Sujata*', vol. I, No. 2.

⁵ *S.I.I.* vol. VI, No. 821.

⁶ *S.I.I.* vol. VI, No. 924.

⁷ *S.I.I.* vol. VI, No. 822.

Andhradēśa. This is No. 3 of the list above.⁸ It does not contain any other information about him.

The Simhāchalam inscription, dated Śaka 1282 records a gift of Kāpaya nāyaka to the temple and contains no other information.

The inscription at Simhāchalam dated Śaka 1291 records to a gift the temple by Koppula Nāmaya nāyaka, who is said to be a member of the fourth caste.

The last inscription of our list registers a gift of [Añ]dulāpalli by Muppamadēvi, wife of Koppulayaṁgāru, to gōd Simhādrinātha, for the growth of prosperity to Koppulayaṁgāru and for the increase of her own life, health, fame and wealth. The date of this grant is Śaka 1310 Kārttika ba 7, Thursday.

Another inscription⁹ of Simhāchalam, not included in the list given above, remains now to be considered. This record describes that Kāpaya was the king of Gudravāṭi *vishaya*, surrounded by the Krishna and the Godāvari. To Kāpaya, the Sāgara or the ocean of Koppula family, was born Prōlaya nāyaka. His son was Koppula nāyaka or Koppa Bhūpati. His son was Prōlaya nāyaka II. After describing the geneology thus far, the inscription informs us that the village of 'Andalāpalli was given as a gift. As the remaining portion of the record is damaged, it is not possible to know the name of the donor. The first two figures of the Śaka years have disappeared; only the last two figures 10 are visible.

If we compare this inscription with No. 6 of our list, we discover that both the donors are one and the same. Further, No. 6 which is in Telugu appears to be the concluding portion of the grant which is not mentioned in the above, list, which describes the geneology of the Koppula

8 The Andhra Research Society of Hyderabad, have published this inscription, in their monthly journal 'Sujāta', 2nd number, with the title "Pillalamarri Inscriptions". According to their reading, the name of the chief is "Kāchayā". The time of the chiefs of Gaṇapēśwaram and Pillalamarri inscriptions is almost the same. So also the title "*Arumanan-gaṇṭipuravarādhīśvara*". Both "*Arumonangallu*", and "*Arumanamgallu*" mentioned in the Gaṇapēśwaram and Pillalamarri inscriptions are the same. This village may be identified with the present "Āmanagallu", ten miles distant from Pillalamarri in the Sūryāpēt taluk of Nalgonda district in the Nizam's Dominions. As the name of the village mentioned in the preamble and the time are almost the same, I thought "Kāchaya" was a misreading for "Kāpaya" and so included the inscription in the above list.

9 S.I.I. vol. VI, No. 823.

10 In S.I.I. vol. VI, the name of this village was read as [Aldulā-palli, which is a misreading. It should be Andalāpalli.

Only two inscriptions of Mummaḍi Nāyaka have been discovered hitherto. One is the Kōrukonda pillar inscription¹² of Śaka 1275; the other is the Śriangam Copper-plate grant¹³ of Śaka 1280, in which, it is said that he married the daughter of the sister of Kāpayanāyaka. The same information is given by the Akkalapūṇḍi Copper-plate grant¹⁴ of Singaya-nāyaka, brother of Mummaḍi nāyaka, dated Śaka 1290. This inscription gives the title of *Āndhra Suratrāna* to Kāpayanāyaka. As both the titles *Āndhradeśādhiśvara* (Overlord of Andhra Country) and *Āndhra Suratrāna* (Sultan of Andhra) are identical, Kāpaya of the Akkalapūṇḍi record may be the same Kāpaya nāyaka, called *Āndhra deśādhiśvara* and *Ārumanangantipuravarēśvara*, of Gaṇapēśvaram and Pillalamarri inscriptions, dated Śaka 1268 and Śaka 1275 respectively. The date also exactly tallis.

IV

Now, there are three Nāyaks, who bore the name Kāpaya; one the father of Prōla I. the other is Kāpayanāyaka of Śaka 1282 (both of the Koppula family) and the third is Mummaḍināyaka's relative and contemporary, of the Pillalamarri and Gaṇapēśvaram inscriptions, who bore the titles *Āndhra deśādhiśvara*, *Āndhra Suratrāna* and *Ārumananganti puravarādhīśvara*. One of these apparently, is identical with the Kāpaya nāyaka of the Kaluvachēru grant, who rescued the country from the Muhammadan yoke. We have to identify him and determine if by 'country', it means the whole of the Āndhradeśa, as we understand it now.

Rao Saheb H. Krishna Sastri identified the Kāpaya nāyaka of the Kaluvachēru grant with Mummaḍināyaka's relative and contemporary, who bore the title of *Āndhra Suratrāna*¹⁵. But obviously this identification is wrong.

We know from the Kaluvachēru grant that prince Vēma was one of the seventy-five feudatory chiefs of Kāpaya nāyaka who became independent, after his overlord's death. He is the same as Prōlaya-Vēma, the founder of the Redḍi kingdom, whose capital was Addaṅki. Hence, Kāpaya nāyaka should have passed away before Vēma commenced to rule independently.

12. *Govt. Ep. coll.* No. 44 of 1912.

13. *Ep. Ind.* Vol XIV, P 83.

14. *Ep. Ind.* Vol XIII, P 259.

15. *Ep. Rep.* for 1912-13, P 129.

The editor, Mr. K. Ramasastri, who published the Akkalapūṇḍi grant of Singaya nāyaka, accepted what the late Mr. Krishna Sastri had written, without verifying the truth of the statement:- Vide *Ep. Ind.* vol. XIII, P. 261.

But there is a good deal of difference of opinion, amongst the scholars, as regards the commencement of the reign of Vēma. Mr. J. Rāmayya Pantulu¹⁶ is of opinion that it was Śaka 1242 while Mr. Ch. Virabhadra Rao, Author of the *History of the Andhras*, takes it to be Śaka 1246.¹⁷ In my opinion both these dates are untenable. The Kākatiya Empire had not yet disappeared by Śaka 1244. There are inscriptions¹⁸ of Kākati Pratāparudra II. of date Śaka 1244 in Kandukūr, a place still to the south of Addāñki, the capital of Vēma. The last invasion by Muhammadans of Warangal took place in Śaka 1245 or 1323 A. D.¹⁹ Even though we know that Pratāparudra was defeated by the Muhammadans and carried away as captive to Delhi, tradition says that he was set at liberty very soon.²⁰ As Rēcharla Singama nāyaka, one of the commanders of Pratāparudra, had the title of *Rāyabandī vimachaka*²¹ there is reason to believe that he obtained that title by securing the release of his sovereign from captivity. Besides these, we find Pratāparudra's inscriptions till Śaka 1248. There is an inscription²² of Kolani Rudradēva, chief minister of Pratāparudra, dated in the cyclic year *Kshaya*, corresponding to Śaka 1248, which records a gift for the merit of the king. Even in the Kaluvachēru grant there is a passage 'प्रतापरुद्रे स्वस्थानां स्वेच्छयैव यातवति'²³ which bears testimony to the fact that Pratāparudra passed away as a free man and not as a captive. The Muhammadan historians, too, do not say that Pratāparudra died in prison.²⁴ For these reasons, we may assume that Pratāparudra II. released from captivity, returned and reigned in the country till Śaka 1248 or A.D. 1326. We have, therefore, to conclude that Prōlaya nāyaka and Kāpaya nāyaka were probably the chiefs who rescued the Andhra country after Śaka 1248. Thus, Vēma could not have founded, and much less ruled an independent kingdom before that date, Śaka 1248 (A.D. 1326).

16. *Ep. Ind.* vol. VIII, P. 13.

17. *History of the Andhras* by Mr. Ch. Virabhadra Rao, Vol III, P. 13

18. Butterworth & Vēnugopāl chetty's *Nel- Ins.* vol. II. Kr no. 40, P. 561. There are some inscriptions of Kākati Pratāparudra II of Śaka date 1244, in Bapatla and Narsaraopeta talukas of the Guntur districts.

19. *Sarikhi- Mubarak- Shahi*: J. B. O. R. S. vol. XV, P. 180.

20. *Prātāpacharitra* (Telugu) by Ēkāmranātha (Published by the *Saivoprachārini Granthamālā*, Warangal), P. 76.

21. *History of the Andhras*, vol. II. p. 375.

22. *Govt. Ep. Coll* No 308 of 1915.

23. Above (first page of this article).

24. *Elliot and Dawson*, Vol III, P 367.

No inscription of Vēma, before Śaka 1252, has been discovered till now. *Local records* mention a copper-plate grant²⁵ of his, of Śaka 1252, which records the gift of the village of Varivēru (? Valivēru) to Rūpākula Brahmabhaṭṭa Sōmayāji, with the right of enjoyment of eight kinds of interest in the land. Its date is stated as follows:

शकाब्दे युगबाणभास्कर युते आंगीरस श्री समे

वैशाखे उडुपे द्विपे कुजदिने श्रीवेमभूपालकः।

ब्रह्मभट्टल महीसुराय नगरीं वर्वेटि ग्रामाभिधां

प्रादा दुज्वल दष्टभोगसहिता माचन्द्रतारार्कगम्।।

The village granted was mentioned as Varivēru, which may be the present Valivēru, in Tenali taluq, Guntur district. This copper-plate grant has not yet come into the collection of the Epigraphical Department. If we set aside this grant as unauthentic, the copper-plate grant No. 5 of 1919—1920 of Śaka 1257 would be Prōlaya Vēma's first inscription, which records a gift of some plots of land in the villages of Chīmakurṭi, Bhīmēśvaram, Purikoṇḍa, Mylavaram and Kumārapuri made to Chittāmaṇi Timmanabhaṭṭa.

If the copper-plate grant of the *Local Records* is to be relied on, we may assume that Vēma began to reign independently from Śaka 1252 or a little before that date. In the alternative, we have to admit that he was ruling independently at least from about Śaka 1257 or A.D. 1335. From these two, whichever date we may assume as correct, it is conclusive that by Śaka 1257, Prōlaya and Kāpaya nāyaka passed away. Kāpaya nāyaka of the Kaluvachēru grant, therefore, could not be Kāpaya nāyaka either of the Gaṇapēśvaram inscription of Śaka 1268 or of Pillalamarri inscription of Śaka 1275 or of Sīmhāchalam inscription of Śaka 1282. If these are thus eliminated, there remains Koppula Kāpaya nāyaka, father of Prōlaya nāyaka and grand-father of Koppula Nāmaya nāyaka; and he may be regarded as the person who rescued the country from the occupation of the Muhammadans and laid again the foundations of Hindu rule. In that case, he is identical with Kāpaya nāyaka of the Kaluvachēru grant.

V

It now remains for us to find out the country, which the Nāyakas Prōlaya and Kāpaya had saved, and over which the latter is said to have reigned. As the inscriptions of the Koppula chiefs are found only along the east coast, it is doubtful whether Kāpaya bore sway

25. *Loc. Rec.* Vol, LVII, P 131.

over the entire extent of territory, which goes by the name of *Āndhradēśa* at present. As no inscription of his has come to light so far, all the available evidence has got to be further examined in this connection.

First, we shall consider the *Rāyalasīma* (Ceded Districts). This tract was under the control of the *Kākatiyas* until 1320 A. D. We are not able to know the rulers of this country in the succeeding years, as the epigraphical evidence is totally absent. However, the Canarese poem *Kumāra Rāmana Charita* informs us that these parts were included in the dominions of the kings of *Kaṁpili*.

Kampilidēva, son of Mummaḍi Singa was governing Kuṇṭala, with fort Hosadurga as his capital. He was frequently at war with Vira Rudra (Pratāprudra II.) of Warangal. On one occasion, the Padmanāyaka chief Singama of the Rēcharla family, invaded the kingdom of *Kaṁpili*, at the head of a large army of Redḍis, Padmanāyakas and Kshātriyas; but in a fierce battle, he was defeated and his camp plundered. However, *Kaṁpilirāya* is said to have given him fifty horses, and concluded a treaty with him.²⁶

It is hardly intelligible why the victorious *Kampilarāya* should have concluded a treaty with his vanquished foe, but such is the story narrated in the poem. If, however, as a consequence of this victory, *Rāyalasīma* was annexed to the Kingdom of *Kaṁpili* this event should have taken place after *Saka* 1242 or A. D 1320; for we find the inscriptions of Pratāparudra II. in this region up to that date. But, it is not said in the poem, that the region was annexed to the Kingdom of *Kaṁpili*, as a consequence of this victory, yet there is one thing which leads to this inference. Prince Rāmanātha (*Kumāra Rāma*), son of *Kampilarāya*, after having vanquished the Muhammadan general Nēmi, sent against him by the Sultan of Delhi, celebrated the event of victory in his capital. It is said that among others, the ruler of *Rāyadurga*, *Pamparāja* of *Penugonḍi* (*Penugonḍa*), *Gangarāja* of *Gaṇḍikōṭa* and

26. *Jour. Myth. Soc.* vol. XX, *Second Series*, October, 1929; See "*Studies in the Vijayanagar History*" by Mr. M. H. Ramasarma, Pp. 95-6. My friend, Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, M. A., Ph. D. has also given this story in his "*Kampili and Vijayanagar*". His treaty portion differs from the above account, a little. According to his version, *Singamanāyaka* was not only defeated by *Kumāra Rāma*, but became his captive also. Then he was taken to *Kampilirāya*, who treated the commander with great respect and liberated him—Vide, "*Kaṁpili and Vijayanagar*", P. 9.

Kāchayya, the lord of Gutti attended the festival²⁷. If they were not the subordinates of Kampilirāya, there could be no reason why they should have been in his capital at the time of the celebration of his victory. This is the only reason for presuming that they were his subordinates. The annexation of Rāyalasīma, if such an event really occurred, should have taken place between Śaka 1242 or A. D. 1320 and Śaka 1249 or A. D. 1327 because the kingdom of Kampili was destroyed by the Muhammadans in that year²⁸.

To find out the truth of the story of *Kumāra Rāmana Charita* it is necessary to see if we can discover the names of these chiefs, in any inscriptions found in their territories. We shall begin with Penugonda. No inscriptions of the rulers of Penugonda between the years A. D. 1320 and 1327 are discovered, and therefore it is not possible to know if the name of its governor was Pamparāja. Saṅgama, according to *Kumāra-rāmana Charita*, is said to have been the governor of Udāyagiri. It is improbable that he was the ruler of that place; for, we find the inscriptions of chiefs of other dynasties in the neighbourhood of Kāvali and Kandukūr. The region around Kāvali was under the sway of a prince called Daśavarma in A. D. 1322²⁹. Udayagiri was probably under his control. At Gaṇḍikōṭa we have inscriptions of the Kākatiya Pratāparudra II until A. D. 1320. If we can trust the *Kaifiyat* of Gandikōṭa, which refers to an inscription³⁰ of Pratāparudra, dated A. D. 1323, the Kākatiya rule may be considered to have lasted until that year. Nevertheless, the *Kaifiyat* speaks of a Chōla chief of the name of Gangarāja. Dēva Chōla Mahārāja, his son, laid siege to the fort of Jagatāpi Gutti and wrested it from its ruler Basava Śankara Rāja³¹. It is thus obvious that the ruler of Gutti at that time was not Kāchayya as the *Kumāra Rāmana Charita* would have us believe. We may regard the case of Gangarāja of Gaṇḍikōṭa as an accidental coincidence. It is clear from the foregoing discussion that Kampilirāya's annexation remains still a matter of considerable doubt. Even if we assume that this fact was not included in Kampilarāya's dominions, it is not possible to maintain

27. *Jour. Myth. Soc.* Vol XX, Second series, Oct. 1929. "*Studies in Vijayanagar History*" P. 103.

28. "*Kampili and Vijayanagar*" by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, P. 22

29. Buttorworth & Vēnugōpālcheṭṭy's *Nel. Ins.* Vol II, Kv.No.11, 707.

30. *Loc. Rec.* Vol XV. P 55.

This is a record of Gonkaya reḍḍi, a subordinate of Pratāparudra II. The record says that he was ruling at Gaṇḍikōṭa in Śaka 1245 or A.D 1323.

31. *Loc. Rec.* Vol XV, PP 51-52.

that the authority of Kāpaya nāyaka extended over it. As we find no evidence of his rule there, it is only reasonable to conclude that it did not form part of his Kingdom.

We shall next proceed to examine whether Kāpaya's rule was recognised in Telingāna. After the fall of Warangal, Telingāna passed for the first time into the hands of the Muhammadans. As the inscriptions of Pratāparudra II. dated in *Sāka* 1248 or A. D. 1326³² are found, it is reasonable to suppose that the Kākatiya rule was recognised in Telingāna, nominally at least from A. D. 1323 to 1326. It was then incorporated within the empire of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak, the emperor of Delhi, who had a revenue register prepared for the province³³. He subdivided the province into two, in A. D. 1335-36 (*Sāka* 1257-58) for administrative convenience. Warangal, renamed Sultānpūr, was fixed as the capital of Northern Telingāna, while Bedadakōṭa or Bedar became the headquarters of Southern Telingāna. Malik Kabūl and Nasrat Khān were appointed as the governors of these two provinces respectively³⁴. Under these circumstances, Kāpaya nāyaka could neither have expelled the Muhammadans from Telingāna, nor could he have established his rule over it.

The eastern Āndhradēsa extending along the Bay of Bengal remains yet to be considered. Although no inscriptions of Kāpaya nāyaka himself are found, several belonging to his descendants have been brought to light. King Vēma, who established the Kondaviḍu kingdom was one of his subordinates. As it is said in the inscriptions that after Kāpaya's death his subordinates asserted their independence in their respective charges, and as Addanki was king Vēma's capital, it appears as if the kingdom of Kāpabhūpati must have extended at least as far as Addanki, if not further. It is clear from this that the kingdom, which Prōlaya and Kāpaya are said to have saved, was confined to coastal region along the shores of the Bay of Bengal. We shall now make an attempt to determine the nature of relationship between Prōlaya and Kāpaya. It may be that after all they were not related to each other, but the opposite view also appears to be maintainable. Kāpaya nāyaka's son was Prōlaya I. According to the custom among the Andhras of naming the grandson after the grandfather, Prōlaya nāyaka (I.) might have been the father of Kāpaya nāyaka. If our surmise be correct, then Prōlaya, II., father of Kāpaya, should have lived at the commencement of the reign of Pratāparudra II. Having lived pretty long, he might have been still alive

32 *Govt. Ep. coll.* No. 338 of 1915.

33 *J. R. A. S.* 1922, p. 339. Mr. Haig says that this work would not have been finished within 1326 A. D.

34 *J. R. A. S.* for 1922.

to expel the Muhammadans from the east coast after the destruction of Kākatiya power³⁵. He might have been succeeded shortly afterwards by his son Kāpaya. But, it is mentioned in the Kaluvachēru grant that Kāpaya bore the burden of the kingdom at the command of Visvēsvara. Therefore, there is room enough for a doubt whether Prōlaya nāyaka was at all related to Kāpaya. If they were really father and son, why should Kāpaya nāyaka commence to rule over his paternal kingdom at any one's command? We cannot, however, assert anything owing to the lack of evidence.

VI.

The Hindus, it is stated, had re-established their independence after expelling the Mahommadans from their country, during the later years of the reign of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak. Ziaud-din Barni³⁶ describes the rebellion thus :

"While this was going on, a revolt broke out among the Hindus at Arangal. Kanyā Naik had gathered strength in the country. Malik Makbūl, the *Naib Wazir*, fled to Delhi and the Hindus took possession of Arangal, which was thus entirely lost. About the same time, one of the relations of Kanyā Naik whom Sultān had sent to Kambala, apostatized from Islam and stirred up a revolt. The land of Kambala also was thus lost and fell into the hands of the Hindus."

Ferishta³⁷ describes it in greater detail :

"This year (*Hijari* 744 = A. D. 1344) Krishn Naig, the son of Luddur Dew, who lived near Wurungole, went privately to Bilal Dew, Rajah of the Carnatic, and told him, that he had heard the Mahomedans, who were now very numerous in the Daccan, had formed the design of extirpating all the Hindus, that it was, therefore, advisable to combine against them. Bilal Dew, convened a meeting of his kinsmen and resolved, first, to secure the forts of his own country, and then to remove his seat of government among the mountains. Krishn Naig promised, on his part also, that when their plans were ripe for execution, to raise all the Hindoos of Wurungole and Telingana and put himself at their head. *

*

*

*

*

*

He

35 *Zia-ud-Din Barni* states that when Arangal was taken, several Mughal armies attacked the frontiers but were repulsed (*Elliot and Dowson*, Vol. III, p. 234) Perhaps these might be the *Turushka* armies, whom Prōlaya nāyaka is stated in the Kaluvachēru grant, to have defeated.

36 *Elliot and Dowson*, Vol III, p p. 245-6.

37 *Brigg's Ferishta*, Vol, p 427.

(Bilal Dew) then raised an army and put part of it under the command of Krishn Naig, who reduced Wurungole and compelled Imad-ool-Moolk, the governor, to retreat to Dowlatabad. Bilal Dew and Krishn Naig, united to their forces the troops of the Rajahs of Maabir and Dwar Sumoodra, who were formerly tributaries to the Government of the Carnatic. The confederate Hindoos seized the country, lately occupied by the Mahomedans in the Deccan, and expelled them, so that within a few months Mahomed Toghluk had no possessions in that quarter except Dowlatabad."

The following points emerge from the accounts of Muhammadan writers. (i) That the person who, with the assistance of the other Hindus princes, set up an independant kingdom in Telingāna, is said by Ferishtā to be Krishna Nāyaka, son of Pratāparudra II. of Warangal, but Barni refers to him as Kaūya nāyak and he has nothing to say about his relationship to Pratāparudra II. (ii) Both the historians agree in stating that the rebellion had broken out during the later years of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak. Ferishta fixes the date in A. D. 1344., but Barni does not mention the date.

Mr. Haig, who has determined the chronology of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak's reign, after comparing the chronicles compiled by several Muhammadan writers, states that Warangal (Telingāna) became an independant state in *H. E.* 746 (*Śaka* 1267-1268 or A. D. 1345-46)³⁸. Therefore the declaration of independence by the Āndhras may be dated in A. D. 1345-46.

It remains to be determined now, whether the leader, who was responsible for the establishment of the independence of Telingāna was a son of Pratāparudra II. We learn from *Ēkāmranāthās Pratāparudra charitra* that Pratāparudra II. had a son called Vīrabhadradēva, who is said to have retired, after the capture of Warangal by the Muhammadans, to the south of the Krishna, where he governed the province of Kondaviḍu for sometime³⁹. No inscription of his has come to light so far. There is no reference to his rule in the Kalavachēru grant also. It is, therefore, doubtful whether Pratāparudra had a son of the name of Vīrabhadra.

According to Ferishta, Krishn Naig, who overthrew the Muhammadan yoke, was a son of Pratāparudra II., but this statement cannot be accepted as true. In the first place, the appellation 'nāyaka' is not suffixed to the names of the Kākatiya monarchs; it is, however,

38 Mr. Īśvaraprasad also is of opinion that this event took place in 1344-1345-Vide, *Medieval India*, p p 247-8.

39 *Pratāparudra charitra* by Ekāmranātha, pp. 79-80.

ally attached to the names of the subordinate chiefs, dependent upon them: *eg*, Māchaya nāyaka, Jāyapa nāyaka, Muppiḍi nāyaka, Singama nāyaka etc. Moreover, Barni, who calls the leader of Telingāna rebellion Kanyā Nāyak, does not tell us that he was a son of Pratāparudra II. Ferishta is the only writer who speaks of the relationship between this Nāyaka and Pratāparudra. Epigraphical evidence, in the light of which the truth of Ferishta's statement can be tested, is totally lacking. Owing to these considerations, it is not possible to believe that Ferishta's Krishna Naig was Pratāparudra's son⁴⁰. According to the custom among the Kākatiya subordinates, to style themselves as the sons of their kings, Krishn Naig, although a subordinate, might have called himself a son of Pratāparudra; and Ferishta, who could not have been aware of this custom must have taken the customary appellation 'son' as literally true. Probably, he was one of Pratāparudra's generals, or a tributary chieftain.

The Hindus were not able to maintain their freedom, which they had won after a strenuous struggle and they lost it before long. One of the rebellions that convulsed the Empire of Delhi during the later years of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak was headed by an officer called Jaffer Khān. Placing himself at the head of 20,000 horse, he marched upon the fortress of Bīḍar, which was then under the command of Imad-ool-Moolk Tubreeji but dared not attack it as it was defended by a powerful imperial force. Jaffer Khān, however, received reinforcements from the king of Telingāna, who despatched a body of 1,500 infantry; Nasir-ud-din Ismail, the rebel king of Daulatabad also sent 5,000 horse. Jaffer Khān was able to take the field against the imperialists with these forces. In a fierce battle, he defeated and slew Imad-ool-Moolk and occupied the fortress of Bīḍar.⁴¹ Jaffer Khan crowned himself the king of Daccan and assumed the title of Bahman Shah. The new kingdom, which he had thus established, was known as the Bahmani kingdom.

Bhaman Shah could not allow the king of Telingāna to remain independant. In spite of the help, which he had received from the king of Telingāna, his feelings of gratitude were not strong enough to

⁴⁰ Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyengar, M. A., states that this Krishnappa Nāyaka,—Ferishta's Krishna Naig—was the eldest son and successor of Pratāparudra II. But this statement cannot be substantiated with the evidence available to us.

⁴¹ Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol II, p. 289; Khāfi Khān—*Elliot & Dowson*, Vol III, p. 14. After being defeated by Kāpaya Nāyaka, Imad-ool-Moolk, the Governor of Warangal, retired to Daulatabad. By the time of Jaffer Khan's invasion he was in Bīḍar.

prevent him from making an attempt to subdue him, as soon as circumstances became favourable. He invaded Telingāna and occupied Kaulas and other places; but the king of that country concluded a treaty with Jaffer Khan (Bahman Shah) and agreed to pay him the tribute, which he was paying lately to the Sultan of Delhi⁴². Bahman Shah is said to have treated the king of Telingāna with great consideration and generosity on account of the assistance which he had received from him in the past.

Although Ferishta, from whom we learn all this information, does not mention in this context, the name of the chief of Telingāna, there is no doubt that he is the same as Krishn Naig, who headed the rebellion against Muhammad-bin-Tughlak. Therefore, the freedom which the Hindus had established, was of short duration. In spite of the fact that the Hindu ruler of Telingāna became a tributary of Bahman Shah, the administration of the country was carried on by him without any outside interference.

Barni, who wrote a history of the Delhi Sultanate and not of the Daccan deals with the history of the latter only, so far, as it is connected with his subject. The long established connection between the Delhi Empire and the province of Daccan was shattered during the reign of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak; and Barni, therefore, does not tell us whether the ruler of Telingāna, who asserted his independence became once again a subordinate of Bahman Shah. But we get some information about the history of Daccan from Syed Ali-bin-Aziz-ul-la Taba, the author of *Burhani-Ma'asir*, which is considered to be a very reliable and authoritative work.

The relations between Bahman Shah and the king of Telingāna are described by this historian⁴³ in the following passage:—

“Sikandar Khān after his return sent a letter to Kanābāyand, who was *Wāṭi* of Telingāna asking him to send a present of some elephants for the use of his army. When Sikander Khān's letter reached Kanābāyand and he understood its contents, he wrote a reply, tendering his submission and sending a written treaty to that effect. He also expressed a great wish to meet him. Accordingly, Sikandar Khan with a large force proceeded towards Telingāna and a meeting between the two took place. Kanābāyand presented many valuable offerings and was made hopeful of much favour from the king. He sent two elephants and other suitable presents to the king through Sikandar Khān. The latter

⁴² Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol III, p. 294.

• ⁴³ Major G. S. King's *The History of the Rahmani Dynasty*. Also, pp. 9-10. in *Ind. Antiquary*.

on arrival at (?) sent the elephants to the Sultan and informed him of the good-will of Kanābāyand. The Sultan wrote a commendatory letter to Sikandar Khān and exalted him to the umberella; and he also conferred royal favours on Kanābāyand."

It is clear from what is said above that Kanābāyand of the *Burhān-i-Ma'asir* is the same as Ferista's Krisna Naig. The leader, who excited a rebellion in Telingāna against the government of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak and ultimately became the subordinate of Bahman Shah is called by different names by the Muhammandan writers: Barni calls him Kanyā Nāyak; Ferishtā, Krishn Naig and Ali-bin-Azizulla, Kanābāyand. As Azizulla's history is considered most trustworthy, we may take Kanābāyand as the real name of the Telingānā-rebel leader.

One small difficulty must, however, be noticed in this connection. Major King, who translated *Burhan-i-Ma'asir* into English, points out that in the British Museum manuscripts of the work, the name is spelt variously: Kananida, Kabānand, Kanānāyand and Kabānāyand⁴⁴. The word in all its various forms falls into two halves; Kabā+nand, Kana+nida, Kanā+nāyand and Kabā+nāyand. The second part represents the transliteration of the corrupt forms of the Telugu words నాయడ నడు or నీడు. This is a mere title, a contracted form of నాయకుడు, suffixed to the personal names of the higher classes of the fourth caste. Here it is added to the personal name Kanā or Kaba. As the last three forms resemble one another and as the first has no such resemblance with any other, therefore, it does not appear to be the correct form. It is not intelligible why Major King used the form Kanābāyand without accepting Kabānand or Kānāyand. We know that the name of the ruler of Telingana terminated with the word nāyak: So, we may take that the name of the leader may be either Kabānāyāk or Kanānāyāk.

We have already shown that this Nāyak asserted his independence between Śaka 1266 or A. D. 1344 and Śakā 1269 or 1346. A chieftain of the name of Kāpayanāyaka is spoken of in the inscriptions of Ganapēśvaram and Pillalamāgri which belonged to this time. He is said to have borne the titles *Andhra Deśādhiśvara* and *Andhra Suratrāna*. I believe that he is the person whom Azizulla refers to as Kabānāyak (Kabānāyand) in his history. He appears to have borne the titles *Andhra Deśādhiśvara* and *Andhra Suratrāna*, by virtue of his victories over the Mussalmans and the establishment of an independant Āndhra kingdom. There was no reason why he should have given up his titles, after submission to Bahman Shah. Pratāparudra II. continued to bear his

ancestral titles, even after his subjugation by the Sultan of Delhi. On account of these considerations, I believe that the form *Kabānāyana* (*Kabānāyak-Kāpayanāyaka*) of Azizulla is the correct name of the rebel chief of Telingāna. I identify him with *Kāpaya-nāyaka* bearing the titles of *Āndhra dēśādhiśvara* and *Āndhra Suratrāṇa*, mentioned in the Ganapavaram and Pillalamarri inscriptions. He appears also to have been a contemporary and relation of Mummaḍināyaka.

It was probably through the help of such a powerful chief as *Kāpaya nāyaka* that Mummaḍi nāyaka and others were able to establish a new kingdom on the banks of the Godāvary and rule with Korukonda as their capital after expelling the chiefs of the Koppula dynasty of Piṭhāpuram, who had to retire in consequence to Kalinga in the north. That is probably the reason why we find the inscriptions of the latter members of the Koppula family at Simhāchalam.

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE KĀKATIYAS.

M. RAMA RAO, B.A. (HONS). M.R.A.S.

The Kākatīya dynasty of Warangal has not yet received from scholars the attention that it deserves. A good many records of this important dynasty have been summarised in the Annual Reports of the Epigraphical Department. The volume of "*Telingānā Inscriptions*", which will be shortly released for publication by the '*Lakshmanarāya Parisodhaka Mandali*' Hyderabad, brings to light many records of unique importance. Tradition and Literature also contain many interesting facts about the Kākatīyas. Thus far only two attempts have been made to reconstruct the history of this dynasty. A chapter has been included about the Kākatīyas in the '*Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan*'.¹ But that is based entirely on inscriptions till then known and is sketchy. A more satisfactory attempt is that found in the latter half of the second volume of the *History of the Andhras*.² Much new matter has come to light since the publication of this work and many facts need alteration. The problems connected with the origin of the Kākatīyas and their rise to power have been discussed by me elsewhere.³ An attempt is being made in this essay to trace the political history of the Kākatīya period; in the light of the material now available.

Prōla II. was the most famous of the earlier Kākatīyas. He was the grandson of Prōla I, the earliest known member of the family and son of Bēta alias Tribhuvana Malla. Very little is known about Prōla's father and grandfather. Apart from the Anumakonda inscriptions,⁴ very few records of Prōla II. have been known till recently. The Telingana Inscriptions bring to light three records which establish the identity of Prōla.⁵ His military exploits are known from his son Rudra's Anumakonda inscription.⁶ Traditional Histories throw light on the building—activity of this monarch.⁷

The Chronology of the reign of Prōla II. is a matter of much difficulty and has not been attempted by previous writers. This monarch's

1 K. V. S. Iyer's *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan*.

2 O. Virabhadrarao's *Andhrula Charitra*,

3 Introduction to the *Telingana Inscriptions*.

4 I. A. XI p. 275; E. I. IX p. 256.

5 Telingana Ins. Kak. Nos. 1, 3, 4.

6 I. A. XI P. 272 and also E. I. III Ganapetvaram Ins.

7 The *Pratāpacharitam*.

Anumakonḍa inscription is dated S. 1039.⁸ Another record is available and mentions a Prōla in S. 1037;⁹ there is nothing to militate against the identification of this Prōla with Prōla II. Since the latter is very near the more definitely known date, Prōla may be said to have commenced his rule in A. D. 1115. There is much uncertainty about his last regnal year. Consequently, it has to be inferred from the initial year of his son and successor Rudra. This date is contained in an inscription from Drākshārāma of the year S. 1010.¹⁰ It is evident then that Prola must have died before that year. It is known that Prōla aided Bijjala, the Kaḷachuri usurper in 1158 A.D., in dethroning Taila III, the Western Chalukyan sovereign.¹¹ This fact, read together with the commencement of Rudra's reign in the same year, leads us to conclude that Prōla died early in the year 1158 A.D. Thus, he must have had a long rule of forty-three years.

The Telugu country was in a chaotic condition when Prola ascended the Kākatiya throne at Anumakonḍa in the first quarter of the twelfth century. The Chālukyas of Kalyān were making rapid progress both in the Dekkan and in the South. They had conquered the whole of modern Telingāna and reached the borders of the Vēngī country. In the East, the sons of Kulōttunga I., the Chālukya-chōla emperor were governing the country as viceroys. Their weak and inefficient rule led to the rise of many minor ruling families, chief of whom were the *Velnādu* rulers.¹² The attention of the Chālukyas of Kalyān and of the Chālukya-Chōlas of the South was focussed on the *Velnādu* country and there was continuous fighting for its possession. While Vikramāditya VI, the Western Chālukyan monarch was thus engaged, his feudatories were busy with their own quarrels. This state of affairs gave a good opportunity for a courageous and ambitious young warrior to assert himself and evolve a separate principality for himself out of the prevailing chaos.

A number of Chālukyan viceroys were ruling in the neighbourhood of the Sabbi 1000 district which Prōla inherited from his father.¹³ Naturally therefore, Prōla came into conflict with these rulers at the outset and his military exploits in this connection are narrated in the Anumakonda record of his son Rudra.¹⁴ Dr. Fleet and H. Krishnasastri have identified most of these Kākatiya rivals.¹⁵ But a number of inscriptions from the Nizam's dominions upset their identifications and lead to

8 E. I. IX p. 256.

9 E. R. No. 216 of 1915.

10 S. I. I. IV No. 1107.

11 Bhandarkar's Early History of the Dekkan p. 222 (3rd Edn.)

12 Vide My paper on The *Velnādu* Chiefs in the J.A.H.R.S. vol IV pt. 1 & 2

13 E. I. IX p. 256.

14 I. A. XI p. 272.

15 Ibid and E. I. III. The Ganapēsvaram Inscription.

fresh ones.¹⁶ Some of the rivals of Prōla were Tailapadeva, Govindaraja, Gunda and Jagaddeva. It is said that Prōla "captured in battle Tailapadeva, the ornament of the Chālūkyan family, but released him out of devotion and affection". Dr. Fleet identified this Taila with Taila III. of the Western Chālūkyan dynasty and thought that this fight must have taken place while Prōla was still a prince, unless it is supposed that he had a very long reign. We have already shown that Prōla had a long reign of forty years. A number of records from Telingana prove that Taila was yet a prince and Chālūkyan viceroy when this fight took place. An inscription from Pānagal mentions that while Tribhuvanamalla was ruling at Kalyān, Bhīma and Gōkarna obtained Brahmapuri from Tailapadeva, son of the Emperor.¹⁷ A Nekkonda record says that Tailapadeva came from his capital Kōḍūr and made gifts at Nekkonda in C.V.E. 46.¹⁸ A third from Būpapūr mentions the same.¹⁹ All the places mentioned above are in the neighbourhood of Anumakonda and the date C.V.E. 46 (A.D. 1122) falls within the reign of Prōla. It is evident then, that Tailapadeva was the Chālūkyan viceroy at Kōḍūr. The Anumakonda inscription also tells us that Prōla re-released Taila out of pity and devotion. This could not be for Taila himself. Inscriptions show that Prōla was a feudatory of Vikramaditya VI. in the earlier part of his reign. Hence, it must be Prōla's devotion for this monarch that led to his release of Taila.

The next rival of Prōla was Govindarāja whom Krishna Sastri identifies with the Govindarasa of the Ablur inscription, the nephew of Daṇḍanāyaka Anantapālayya and ruler of Kondapalli.²⁰ Many records from Dakshārāma show that this General was in possession of the Vengi country between 1120—23 and defeated by Gonka II, of the Velnāḍu family.²¹ An inscription from Nalgonda in the Hyderabad State mentions him in S. 1045 (1123 A.D.)²² From this it may be inferred that after his defeat Govindaraja withdrew into the modern Telingāna, probably after the death of Vikramaditya VI. in 1127. Prōla defeated this general.

Another rival was Gunda of Mantrakūṭa, on whom Prōla is said to have inflicted severe humiliations. It has been believed that this Mantrakūṭa is identical with the village of Mantena in the Nuzvid Zamīndārī of the Krishna district.²³ But this view seems to be untenable.

16 Vide my Intro. to Telingana Ins.

17 Tel. Ins. ch. 37.

18 Ibid ch. 33.

19 Ibid ch. 24.

20 I. A. XI p. 272.

21 Vide My paper on The Velnāḍu Chiefs.

22 Vide Sujata Jan, 1927.

23 See Krishnasastri's Ganapesvaram Ins. in E. I. III.

Manthana is too far off from Anumakonda to be included in the zone of Prōla's military activities. Nearer the Kākatiya capital, on the river Godavary, in the Hyderabad state there is a village called Manthani which is associated both in the Local Records and in living popular tradition with the Kakatiyas.²⁴ The sequel to this engagement between Prōla and Gunḍa is given in the Rāmappaguḍlu inscription of Rēcherla Rudra Sēnāni.²⁵ It is said therein that Kāmachamūpati of the Rēcherla family pursued this Manthanya Gunḍa and slew him. So the Gunḍa of the Anumakonda inscription must be identified with the ruler of Manthana.

Jagaddēva was by far the most powerful of Prōla's enemies. It is said that he gathered together all his co-feudatories and besieged Anumakonda. This Jagaddēva has been identified by Dr. Fleet with the Sānbāra chieftain of that name ruling at Pontumpambacchupura in modern Mysore state. Like Manthana above, this place is also too distant from Prōla's capital. There is a Jagaddēva figuring nearer Anumakonda, as the ruler of the Dharmapuri and Lēmulaṇḍa region. An inscription from Ganapavaram not only reveals this chieftain but confirms the fact of his struggle with Prōla. According to this record Jagaddēva succeeded Dēvabhūpāla and after him Prōla the Kakatiya king ruled.²⁶ At Naganūr there is an inscription which mentions that in C.V.E. 4. Dommerāju, Jagaddēva and Mēdarāju fought with an army of 80000.²⁷ A record from Lēmulaṇḍa mentions that place as the capital of Jagaddeva in S. 1051 (A.D. 1109).²⁸ It may be concluded that this was the chieftain defeated by Prōla.

The facts noted above show that Prōla must have started his victorious campaign towards the close of the reign of Vikramaditya VI, and that most of the chieftains conquered by him were either generals or viceroys of the Western Chalukyas and rulers in the immediate neighbourhood of Anumakonda. That Prōla's aggressive career went on unchecked is shown by the independant style of his later records. Sōmēśvara III is said to have fought with an Andhra king; this was probably Prōla II, and the fight must have resulted in the weakening of the Chālukyan power. Nothing untoward seems to have happened during the reign of Jagadēkamalla II. By 1150 A. D. Taila III ascended the Chālukyan throne and by that time Prōla had completed his conquests. The Warangal Mahaboobnagar, Karimnagar and Nalgonda districts came completely under his subjection and his dominion reached the borders of the Veinādu

24 Vide Pratāpacharitam, the Ekasilānagara Vrittantam.

25 Hyd. Arch. Series No. 4.

26 Tel. Ins. k. 18.

27 Ibid ch. 17,

28 Bharati vol. VI No. 5.

country in the east. In A.D. 1158 an important event took place which undermined the power of the Chalukyas of Kalyān and led to the formal proclamation of independence by Prola II. Bijjala, the Kalachuri feudatory overthrew Taila with the aid of Prōla and Vijayārka, the ruler of Kolhapur.²⁹ This shows the powerful position of Prōla. The Chalukyan dominion was torn into pieces. Prōla took advantage of this opportunity and consolidated his territory into an independant kingdom:

The few inscriptions of this monarch's reign bring to light a number of his officers. His Canarese record at Anumakonda mentions the minister Beta who was a great scholar and was renowned for his charities. His wife Mailama instituted the temple of Kadalālaya on the hill at Anumakonda. This is the earliest known structure of the Kakatiya period.³⁰ Maḥāsāmanta Mallenāyaka was another subordinate of Prola and is known from an inscription at Mātūr in the Warangal district.³¹ A record from Karimnagar³² reveals the name of the minister Gangādhara who was commissioned by Prōla to look after the affairs in the royal palace.

Prola seems to have been a great builder of temples and tanks. He is said to have instituted Jalandharesvara Bhairava at Inugurti³³ and constructed a big tank called Jagatkēsarin. Tradition ascribes to him the foundation of Ēkaśilānagara, the modern Warangal and the capital of the Kākatiyas in their halcyon days.³⁴ Mention has been already made of the Kadalālaya temple at Anumakonda built in the time of Prōla.

It is not known how this monarch met with his end. Tradition mentions that he was slain by his own son in the Svayambhu temple, by oversight.³⁵ But inscriptions seem to imply a different and probably more reliable version. In a Dākshārāma inscription Choda II (1163-81) of the Velnadu family is called "Kākati-Prōla-Nirdahana".³⁶ We have shown above that Prōla ceased to reign in A. D. 1158. We have to conclude therefore that Choda II. must have achieved this feat while yet a prince. This naturally leads us to infer that after the fall of Taila III in 1158, Prōla invaded the Velnādu country which lay immediately to the south-east of his dominion. The ruler of Velnādu at this time was Gonka II. The latter's son, Choda must have fought with Prola and in all probability, killed him.

29 Bhandarkar's Early History of the Dekkan, p. 222.

30 E. I. IX p. 256.

31 Tel. Ins. k. 4.

32 Ibid k. 5.

33 Ibid k. 3.

34 The Pratāpacharitam.

35 Ibid.

36 S. I. I. Vol 1 V No, 1242.

Thus was the kingdom of the Kākatiyas founded. Prola was a great warrior, with much foresight and unparalleled military skill. He was a great opportunist. Hurling defiance in the face of the weaker successors of a falling monarch, he contended against a heterogeneous complex of Chalukyan feudatories, worsted each of them with the thoroughness and vigour, struck the final blow at the shadow of the Chalukyan power and laid the foundations of an independant Andhra Kingdom which was to last for two and a half centuries and turn the tide of events in the Dekkan and South India. Prōla must have started his military career early in his youth and lived to a ripe old age. It is no exaggeration to say that he lived, fought and died for the Kākatiya kingdom. How his son Rudra who was a greater warrior and greater statesman expanded the kingdom into the Kakatiya Empire and stabilised Andhra rule in the Dekkan, will be shown in the following chapters.

THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE INDIAN HISTORICAL RECORDS COMMISSION.*

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

The 13th session of the Indian Historical Records Commission was held in Patna on Monday the 22nd instant, at 11 a. m. under the presidentship of Sir Jadunath Sarkar M.A., Kt. C.I.E.

Fifty members of the Commission including the Representatives of the several Local Governments and Universities and Native States attended.

Opening the proceedings of the meeting His Excellency Sir Hugh Stephenson, the Governor of Bihar and Orissa, said:—
Gentlemen,

I am very glad indeed to welcome the Indian Historical Records Commission to Patna for its thirteenth session. I will not reproach the Commission for not coming here sooner inasmuch as one of the original objects of the Commission was to advise and stimulate the various Governments in the matter of the historical value of their records and the necessity of properly preserving them and the fact that we come so low down on the list might be taken as a compliment implying that we need no stimulus, though always thankful for advice. But the main reason I take it is that we are a very young Province and that at the time of our creation in 1912 Bengal decided, probably rightly, that there was no justification for breaking up the records of the old Subah of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, though I am not sure that there may not have been an element of the feeling that we were too young to be entrusted with these important matters. It was decided that we should only have the current records, and, as a working arrangement, it was settled that anything before the Mutiny should be regarded as an historical record. For those written official records of our past history we have to go to Calcutta and I should like to bear testimony to the consideration and assistance we invariably receive from the authorities there when we have occasion to consult these records.

* The Writer of the article was deputed by the Society to attend the I.H.R. Commission and the All-India Oriental Conferences held at Patna in December 1930. He was co-opted as a Member of the Commission by the Government of India and deputed to attend it by the Madras Government. He is again selected by the Government of India as a Corresponding Member of the Commission till 1933.

For Government papers therefore of real antiquity in this Province we can only look to the district record room, and I remember that when I was an Under-Secretary in Calcutta, long before the partition, these district record rooms were fairly thoroughly ransacked and some of their treasures brought to Calcutta for preservation. You will however, hear presently from Mr Kamal Krishna Bose a paper on the nature and range of the Bihar and Orissa Records, the fruits of an examination conducted by him under the guidance of your President, Sir Jadunath Sarkar. Mr. Mitra, too who has carried on Sir Jadunath's work after he left us, is also reading a paper and I will therefore leave this subject to them; if I ventured to touch on it I might trip up and I feel sure that they would be very uncomfortable at having to expose my ignorance. But a "Sarkari hukum" altering the boundaries of the province cannot take away from the people their history. The Commission's main concern is with written documents, but you would be the first to admit that written records do not by themselves carry far the history of a country like India. Comparatively soon we get below the solid foundation of written records and wander in the dim caves where inscriptions, excavations, coins and so forth are our only lights. In this field we claim that we have found much treasure and there are still vast accumulations to reward the patient explorer. Those of you who have attended the Oriental Conference and the Numismatic Society's meetings will know the work that our Research Society and our individual enthusiasts have done and the pride we take in the history of our past. Taking only the comparatively recent period of history there is much to be learnt of historical and human interest from such things as old inscriptions in the Christian burial grounds, the list of which Mr. Justice James, one of the Corresponding members of the Commission, has undertaken to revise.

But even within your own more particular field I am certain that there is much material outside Government record rooms which has not yet seen the light of day. The old families of Bihar, the priestly families and the old chieftains of Orissa, with their long genealogies rooting far back into the past must, I am sure, have written Sanads and other records which have escaped destruction and are stored away in their archives, possibly forgotten even by the family traditions. The main reason for expanding your body from a small Committee of experts to a wider Commission of zealous students of history, with Corresponding members, was to endeavour to draw forth historical treasures from their unknown hiding places; and your experience of the past few years has shown that the interest stimulated by your sessions, by the attendance of the public at the reading of fascinating and often romantic stories of history has set those who had hitherto been indifferent, and had cared for none of these things, to a search that has produced most valuable finds. From this point of view I specially welcome your presence in Patna under the presidency

of Sir Jadunath Sarkar whose consuming zeal is familiar to us and whose advice on historical research at a recent Convocation of the Patna University is still ringing in our ears. I trust that the good seed he sowed will produce its harvest of research workers among graduates and undergraduates and the presence of Mr. Khosala as a delegate from the University is a proof that the University's interest and assistance will not fail you. I appeal now to the wider public to help in the work; let those who possess family or State records have them scientifically examined, and submit to experts all documents that may even remotely prove to be of historical interest; and let those who possess none use their influence to rouse their more fortunate brethren. As His Excellency the Viceroy said last year, "No nation can afford to ignore the story of its past. No people can properly develop without a knowledge of the factors which have gone to make them what they are." The possessors of these documents are in a sense trustees for the public; the expense of fulfilling their trusteeship is trifling and we have now an ever-growing band of research students who will make the labour easy. May the session of the Commission in Patna, which in the matter of historical interest, refuses to yield the plan to any other city, lead to a zealous search for further historical records which I am convinced will be successful.

Sir Jadunath Sarker, then spoke as follows:—

On behalf of the members of the Historical Records Commission I thank your Excellency for the cordial welcome you have extended to us on our first visit to this province. To my regret, and I am sure, you share my feelings, Sir Frank Noyce, our official President is unable to attend owing to pressure of public business at Delhi and we have been thus deprived of his experience, suavity and tact in conducting our deliberations. He has conveyed to us his best wishes for our success and interest for our work.

We have long felt that our task should remain incomplete so long as we did not hold a session in Bihar and study the records of a province which yields to none in the importance of the part it has played in shaping India's destiny from the dawn of recorded history. If I may be permitted to mingle a personal strain on this occasion, I shall confess that, having been a member of this Commission ever since its foundation, it would have been a great disappointment to me if I did not see my colleagues brought into personal touch with the workers among the records of this province. I owe no small debt to Bihar; I have spent my entire active career, less than three years, in this province. I may even claim Patna as my spiritual home. Here I have found opportunities unequalled elsewhere in India for studying the past history of India at its fountain head. Here I have received a living inspiration from the great monuments of the past all round

us. The call to help in arranging and listing the British records of the province came to me so late that I had not half completed the work before I was suddenly removed to another sphere of activity. The history of Bihar and the progress of historical investigation here cannot but be matters of the deepest interest to me and I am glad to see from the range and quality of the local contribution of papers at this session that the future is full of promise.

This being the first occasion when the local public have seen this Commission, it may not be unnecessary for us to introduce ourselves. This Commission originated in a very small body of official Record Keepers and historical experts formed by the Government of India to advise it and the local Governments as to the best treatment of their records, the proper method of caring for, preserving, weeding out, listing and editing them and deciding the problems that arise from time to time regarding the work of Government Record Offices. But it was soon realised that not all the historical records even of the British period are in Government's hands, but many private persons, specially representatives of historical families, possess documents of first rate importance some time unique in their nature, for the reconstruction of India's past annals, and that unless these resources are made known and available to scholars it would be as impossible to write a true and full history of India as it would be to write the history of England without using the paper in the possession of Cecil and Walsingham, Buckingham and Grenville families. Sir Henry Sharp, therefore, planned to interest the outer public in our work and to tempt private records out of their seclusion by adding to our original technical deliberations a public session in which all could join and where papers of general interest would be read to illustrate what records are known to exist and how they throw new light on our country's past. The Exhibition has been our most helpful auxiliary for this purpose and in many cases it has made our history live before our eyes once again. This natural endeavour to complete our work found a striking appreciation last year when, for the first time, we met in an Indian State at its invitation. I am glad to have noticed in our sessions as well as in the course of my frequent travels a keen awakening in the Indian States as to the need of exploring the past achievements of their ruling dynasties and the history of their territory by rising above the stage of legends and bardic traditions and securing an authentic basis of facts it might be acceptable to historians abroad. Nearly all the great States now send their delegates to our annual meeting. As a life-long student of Indian history, I do hope that the cultural nexus thus begun between British and Indigenous India of both sides by the States organising their records offices on modern lines, arranging and cataloguing their papers, and throwing them open to

genuine research workers of all provinces under the safeguards usually observed in the British Record Offices, and that on the other hand Record Officers and Research students selected by the Indian States would be given by the British Government in its own archives, opportunities of learning the proper method of handling records and for exploring such records in British possession as relate to the history of their respective States. As an illustration, I may mention that the recent examination of only a portion of the Peshwas' Daftar in Poona has revealed a vast and virgin field for research in which British India and the Deccan States (Hyderabad and Mysore, no less than the Maratha principalities) can most usefully co-operate, for, without such co-operation the exploration of such a vast and varied mass of documents cannot be satisfactorily completed within a reasonable length of time, nor the result of the research made available to scholars. This is a line of operation which this Commission in the interests of scholarship may well recommend to the Bombay Government and the States concerned.

In connection with this body of records, the Commission will be glad to learn what the Bombay Government has done during the last twelve months, and I am sure the Commission will join the world of scholarship outside in thanking that Government for doing so much. In this year of severe financial stringency and harassing distraction, due to the organised lawlessness, the Bombay Government has pushed on the exploration and sorting of the Peshwas' Daftar by a competent staff and already issued two admirably printed volumes containing the Maratha records relating to the Udgir and Panipat campaigns from these archives. The changes in our personnel this year are few. Rao Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar has taken the place of Mr. G. S. Sardesai whose three years term expired last October. We have thus lost the benefit of the ripe experience of this veteran historian of the Marathas who has been working among the Poona records so strenuously and fruitfully. Rao Bahadur Krishnaswami Aiyangar will, for the next three years, represent Madras, which had no permanent member since Mr. Dodwell left, excepting Mr. Julian Cotton for a short time.

After the President's reply, 24 papers or their summaries were read and they dealt with the methods of record-keeping, range and nature of records of different provinces and districts, sanads and inscriptions on tombs, and the commercial history of Patna.

At 4-30 P.M. the members of the Commission were photographed with His Excellency on the northern steps of the Patna Museum. At 4-40 P.M. the Historical exhibition was declared open to the Public by His Excellency. The exhibits consisted of Farmans, Letters, Coins, Weapons, Historical paintings, Manuscripts, Portrait Albums, Pictures, Seals, Copperplates

and Imperial and Provincial records as well as records from Native states, Public institutions and private individuals. All these were of great historical interest.

At 5 P. M. Tea was provided for all Members of the Commission on the terrace of the Museum at the kind invitation of the Hon'ble the Minister of Education of Bihar and Orissa, and with this, the day's functions came to an end.

On 23rd December, at 8 A. M. all the members assembled at the Patna Museum and were first shown round the Museum and then the Golah, the Oriental Public Library and the site of the Dutch Factory, till 11 A.M.

The following accounts of the places visited, taken from *A short account of Patna* issued by the Local Officer of the Commission, will be found interesting:—

Patna Museum.

The Museum was opened in 1929 and is "a handsome building in Rajput style, richly embellished with Agra carved stone work".

The prehistoric section contains interesting palaeoliths, collected in the Ranchi and Singhbhum Districts and elsewhere, by Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Ray and others; copies of rockpaintings from the Raigarh State and elsewhere, made under the supervision of the Curator, Rai Sahib Manoranjan Ghosh; and neolithic celts. There is a fine collection of copper axeheads, besides other prehistoric antiquities.

In the collection of historical antiquities, perhaps the finest single piece is the Didarganj statue of the Mauryan period with mirror-like polish. The Bulandibagh stone-capital is a fine specimen of a sculptured architectural piece, and is of great historical importance. Another interesting exhibit is the Bulandibagh chariot-wheel." Specially noteworthy among the Pataliputra finds (from the Kumarahar and Bulandibagh excavations) are the famous "laughing" boy and girl (terracotta heads), the so-called Bodh Gaya terracotta votive plaque the picture of which is given on the membership card, a gold signet-ring and a unique collection of glass seals with Brahma legend. A speciality of the Museum is the fine collection of terracotta figurines from excavations of the following sites, viz., Pataliputra, the University area, Behva Buxar and Basarh. The last-named site proved particularly rich in clay seals. Other exhibits, which deserve special mention, are the sandstone coping, the vase-shaped pedestal from the Chankrama Manjusri figure and a seated Buddha figure in Bhumpisporsa Mudra (all from Bodh Gaya), and the unsoiled Gupta pillar from Bihar Sharif. Two fine Bodhisattva figures from Hasrakol are beautiful examples of medieval art.

The Museum possesses a collection of estampages of all the important inscriptions of the Province and a fine plaster-cast of the famous Hathigumpha inscription of Kharavela. There is a valuable collection of medieval copper-plate grants, mainly obtained from the Orissa Feudatory States. The earliest copper-plate is one of King Pravarasena II of the Vakataka dynasty, *circa* 5th century A. C.

The numismatic section is particularly interesting. In addition to the very fine collection of early punchmarked and cast coins, the Museum possesses a collection of Gupta coins which is one of the finest of its kind outside the British Museum, besides tribal coins of Indo-Parthian, Indo-Scythian and Indo-Kushan Kings, Pathan and Mughal coins. A unique specimen is the portrait, with goblet of wine, and a gold coin of Jahangir and the gold Asvamedha coin of Kumargupta.

The Museum possesses an ethnological collection of considerable local interest containing three new plaster models of Mundas nicely done, a representative geological collection (including a fossil tree about 52 feet in length, found near Asansol, and a small industrial collection; and among the miscellaneous exhibits may be mentioned the Sati stones from Manbhum and some unique Medieval Buddhist sculptures from Orissa.

Pataliputra Excavations.

Scholars at first thought that some other town was the ancient Pataliputra. The doubt was set at rest by the Jaina inscription at Gularbagh. The identification has been confirmed by excavations. It was Col. Waddell who started afresh the identification of the ancient town. Mr. P. C. Mukerji first excavated near the town, and located Kumhrar. Near Kumhrar is the Patna Dargah, where Mr. Jayaswal discovered the arch-stone with Pre-Asokan letters (now in the Patna Museum).

At Kumhrar, Dr. Spooner excavated the hundred-pillared Hall. The Bodh Gaya terracotta Plaque with Kharosthi inscription and Brahmi glass seals are objects which were obtained at the site and now housed in the Patna Museum. On the site we can see the stone pillar still lying with mason marks at the bottom. In the pit, when dry, one can see wooden planks which date from the Mauryan times.

Not far from this, on the south, are the mounds of Pahari where no systematic excavation has been made, but which, according to Fa-Hian's description, should contain two inscribed pillars of Asoka.

Within a furlong from Kumhrar to the North-West is the Bulandibagh site. Here the Palisades were traced by Dr. Spooner. Rai Saheb Manoranjan Ghosh excavated the military earthen wall, flattened by palisades, which has been identified as the Kardama bita, of the Gaya Samhita by Mr. Jayaswal. A sketch of the Palisade can be seen in the

Museum done under the direction of the Curator when he was excavating the site. Bulandibagh has yielded a good collection of terracotta figurines which every Museum will like to have. They show a variety not met with elsewhere. The wooden wheel, the gold signet ring, a small bronze mirror, some glass seals with Brahmi legends are also objects of interest obtained from Bulandibagh. At the back of the University buildings deep trenches were excavated for constructing underground drains. The late Mr. V. H. Jackson, Principal, Patna College, collected interesting objects excavated from that place. All the antiquities excavated from various Pataliputra sites are now exhibited in the Patna Museum.

The Gola.

The Gola, is an enormous granary, built in the shape of a bee-hive in 1786 "for the perpetual prevention of famine in these provinces". From the top of it, the party could see the whole city and the rivers.

Oriental Public Library.

The Khuda Bakhsh Library (to call it by the name by which it is commonly known) is one of the finest collections of Islamic literature in the world.

Khan Bahadur Khuda Bakhsh, C.I.E., the founder of the Library, was born at Chapra, in 1842. His family, which was of scholarly traditions, came originally from Delhi, settled down at Chapra, and removed to Bankipore soon after Khuda Bakhsh was born. His father, Muhammad Bakhsh, had a passion for Persian and Arabic literature, and though not a rich man succeeded in adding over 1,000 MSS. to the small library he had inherited. On his death-bed in 1876, he committed to his son the task of adding to the collection and converting it into a public library; in spite of all obstacles (financial and otherwise), Khuda Bakhsh fulfilled this solemn trust to the latter. Before his death, in 1908, he had enriched the collection by the addition of some 3,500 Persian and Arabic MSS. (many of rare, and some of unique, value); he spent Rs. 63,000 in the acquisition, in England, of a fine collection of standard English works, handsomely bound (including, among other rare and valuable books, a set of the first edition of the Waverley Novels); in 1881, at a cost of Rs. 80,000, he erected a library building, which has been aptly described as "a worthy setting for the jewels it contains"; and he opened his library to the public in 1891. Lord Curzon's interest was aroused in the Library, which he visited in 1903; and a garden was added to the library premises, and the work of publishing a catalogue, worthy of the collection, was taken in hand under the guidance of Sir Denison Ross, then Principal of the Calcutta Madrasa. This admirably planned catalogue raisonne of the Persian and Arabic MSS. in the Library is now nearing completion. It will consist of some 25 volumes in all, of which 16 volumes have been published.

Like his father, Khuda Bakhsh was a legal practitioner, and rose to eminence in his profession. In 1880 he was appointed Government Pleader of Patna; and in 1895 he went, for three years, to Hyderabad, as Chief Justice of the Nizam's High Court. Practically all his earnings he spent on the Library. He was an accomplished Persian scholar and poet, and well-versed in Arabic; and he was one of the greatest authorities on Islamic bibliography.

Enriched by several valuable gifts and by acquisitions subsequent to the founder's death, the Library now contains some 2,250 Persian and 3,250 Arabic MSS. "Rare and charming as are the specimens of Eastern painting and Persian penmanship," writes Mr. Salahuddin Khuda Bakhsh, "the value and importance of the library lie in its vast store of works on law and history, philosophy and theology, science and medicine, which are absolutely unique and in most cases unknown to the world of letters". The Library possesses a rich collection of poetical works, some of them sumptuously illuminated and many magnificently bound. There are two copiously and quaintly illustrated Arabic works, of great historical importance; one a treatise on surgical instruments, composed by Zahravi in Granada and another on botany, being a translation of the "Materia Medica" of Dioscorides. Among the many rare Persian MSS. is the first half of Jami's autograph works, of which the second half was formerly in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. Of peculiar historical interest are Jahangir's "Book of Fate" (a copy of the Odes of Hafiz); the works of Khasrau, containing the seal of Akbar's mother; Jahangir's "Autobiography," presented by him to the King of Golconda; two common-place books of Shah Jahan; and Jami's poem "Yusuf was Zulaikha" copied by the greatest of Persian calligraphists, Mr. Ali, for which Jahangir paid 1,000 gold mohurs. Among the magnificent illuminated manuscripts may be mentioned a History of the House of Timur (embellished with no less than 133 full-page illustrations), which was made for Akbar and contains the autograph of Shah Jahan; the Padishahnamah, or history of the reign of Shah Jahan; the Shahinshahnamah of Husaini, celebrating the victories of Sultan Muhammad II (the conqueror of Constantinople), composed in 1594 and presented to Sultan Muhammad III; the Shahnamah of Firdausi, presented illuminated copy of the same. The specimens of painting (Chinese, Persian and Indian) here collected are invaluable to the student of Oriental art. Finally, as a specimen of exquisite penmanship, should be mentioned the Koran of Yaqut-al-Mustasmi, dated 668 A. H. (= 1254 A. D.), written in three different styles, one of which (the Naskh character) Yaqut-al-Mustasmi himself originated.

Members' Business Meeting.

From 11 a.m. to 2 p.m., the Members met at the University Library to transact business. A conspectus of the action taken by the

Government of India and the Local Governments on the resolutions passed at the twelfth meeting held at Gwalior was placed on the table.

The Dutch records of Chinsura were removed to the Imperial Record office. The term of office of the Corresponding members was fixed at three years as is the case of the ordinary members. Selections from the Peshwas' Daftar are printed and published and certain records only are made available to scholars for study. Portions of the Mackenzie manuscripts are to be copied and preserved at Madras. Improved methods of record-keeping and preservation of records were suggested by Mr. H. L. O. Garret M.A., I.E.S. It was strongly urged that the Government of Bombay should be requested to complete the exploration, selection and editing of the historical records in the Peshwas' Daftar at Poona and the Government of Bengal to locate the District Records at a convenient centre so as to make them available to the advanced students and teachers of Indian History. Openings for Army historical research in India were suggested for the benefit of bonafide research students. A few other matters were also discussed.

The following papers were laid on the table:—


1. Annual Report of the record offices in India.
2. Report of the classification of the Company records in the Imperial record department.
3. Report of research work done by certain Corresponding members of the commission.
4. Correspondence regarding the continuance of the series of publication entitled "English Factories in India" and the treatment of records in the Bombay Secretariat.
5. Other correspondence.

More Visits.

In the Evening, from 2-30 p.m. to 4 p.m., the members visited the site of the old English factory, the tomb of Nawab Muniruddowlah, the Cathedral, the Cemetery and the houses of Kheyali Ram and Ram Narayan where Guru Govind Singh was born in 1664.

At 4-30 p.m. the Hon'ble Rai Bahadur Radha Krishna Jalau was "At Home" to all the Members of the Commission at his residence to enable them to see the site of the Fort of Sher Shah and to inspect his collection of historical objects. After the Patna massacre of 1763, it was decided to remove the old English Factory and to locate it, a house was built in 1765 on the west of the Fort (Quila) area. It is that house with its beautiful position on the River Ganges that is now owned by the Hon'ble Rai Bahadur.

With this function, the Session ended.




Seated left to right:—Rao Bahadur Dr S. K. Aiyangar, Mr A. F. M. Abdul Ali, Mrs Kamala Bai Kib
His Excellency Sir Hugh Stephenson, Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Lady Stephenson,
Mr H. G. Rawlinson, Mr H. L. O. Garrett, Dr S. N. Sen.

Standing left to right:—1st row: Mr K. P. Jayaswal, Dr Balakrishna, Hakim Habibur Rahman, Mr M. Mah-
fuzul Huq, Mr R. Subba Rao, Dr R. C. Majumdar, Mr K. Nilkanta Sastri,
Rao Bahadur R. Krishnarao Bhonsle, Mr Paramanand, Mr K. B. R. Dongre,
Mr M. B. Grade, Sir J. J. Modi.

2nd row: Mr A. Ghosh, Rao Bahadur M. V. Kibe, Mr D. V. Potdar, Khan Bahadur
D. F. Wakil, Mr R. Satinath Aiyar, Mr Paramanand Acharya, Mr Y. K.
Deshpande, Mr P. C. Nahar, Mr S. C. Sarkar.

3rd row: Mr H. Lambert, Mr N. J. Seth, Mr T. G. P. Spear, Mr V. V. Thakur,
Dr R. K. Mukherji, Mr J. C. Talukdar, Mr S. V. Puntambekar, Dr S. C. Sa-
kar, Dr Azimud-din Ahamad, Pandit Bisheshwarpath Rou.

4th row: Mr A. B. A. Haleem, Laia Sitaram Kohli, Mr S. K. Sen, Mr R. P. Khosla,
Mr K. K. Bose, Dr J. C. Sinha, Mr S. K. Bhuyan, Mr S. K. Oka,
Khan Bahadur Abdul Majtadir.



THE KALINGA GANGA AND KADAMBA GOLD COINS. 1

R. SUBBA RAO, M.A., L.T.

The Gaṅga and Kadamba coins, made of gold, are called at present by the name of *Vaṅga parakalu* which mean brinjal seeds as they look like them, and *Pūja chihṇams* which mean the symbols of worship as they were used for offerings to Gods and Brahmins. They are discovered, every now and then, after heavy rains on old historical sites in Kaliṅgadesa like Kaliṅgapaṭṭanam, Mukhalingam, Dantapuram and Santa Bommāli. They are also called Gaṅga *fanams* or Matsya *fanams* or Simha *fanams* according to the emblems they bear.

A Gaṅga *fanam* is equal in weight to five or six grains or two seeds of *Kaṭanju* or *Molucca* bean (*coesalpinia bonduc*). It is a die-struck piece, small in size, and spherical in shape but useful for *Dakṣiṇa* or charity to Brahmins and to Gods. They bear the religious devices of *Śivalingam*, a recumbent Bull, conch and crescent struck on them. The gold used was probably imported from Rome. In order that the coins in gold might be accessible to all, they were minted by kings in small denominations of $1/8$, $1/4$ and $1/2$ fanams. The quarter fanams, as the present coins are, would cost four annas.

In Plate I (above) coins Nos. 5, 6 and 9 and in Plate II (below) coins Nos. 6 and 9 have got a figure of Roman scale, a trade mark showing commercial relationship between Rome and Kalingadēśa in ancient times.

In both the Plates, the obverse and the reverse sides of each coin are shown side by side.

Plate I (above.)

a. Coin No. 1 shows, on the obverse side, a couchant *nandi* or bull facing left and a crescent at the top of it.

The reverse side has a letter 'om'.

b. Coins Nos. 2, 4, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 15 have on their obverse sides what looks like an elephant-goad and on their reverse sides, a

* These gold coins have been secured at my instance by S. Gopala Krishnamurthy and afterwards purchased by me for the Society's Museum. I presented two gold coins to the society which I got from Razam. In all, the Society has got at present twenty-seven of these coins. Three more coins which are shown in the photo-prints were returned to the owners. An article on these coins has been published in telugu by S. G. Krishnamurthy in *Kaliṅgadesacharitra*, edited by me.

numerical number probably the regnal year of the king when the coin was minted and a *chaturasramu*.

c. Coins Nos. 3, 6 and 9 have on their obverse sides a Roman balance and on the reverse sides a numerical number and religious signs like *Sivalingam* and *Nandi*.

d. Coins Nos. 5, 7, 10 and 14 bear *Sivalingam*, *Nandi* and crescent on the obverse sides and numerical numbers on the reverse.

Plate II (below)

1. *Ob.* A couchant caparisoned bull, facing left with a crescent of the moon above.

R. A *chaturasramu* and the telugu numerical number 1. The numerical number may refer to the regnal year of the king.

2. *Ob.* A lion with a raised paw.

R. The letter 'Va'. It probably refers to their capital Vanavāsi in Kalinga.

This is probably a Kadamba coin.

3. *Ob.* Elephant-goad. The Ganga kings were famous for their elephant fights.

R. A *chaturasramu* and numerical number.

4. *Ob.* Two fishes and below it the telugu numerical number 1.

R. A *Sivalingam*, *Nandi*, and crescent. This is probably a Matsya coin. The Matsya kings of Oḍḍadi were vassals of the E. Gangas.

5. *Ob.* A Vessel with two masts and sails. The Kalingas were noted for their commercial and colonial pursuits.

R. A *Sivalingam*, *Nandi* and crescent.

6. *Ob.* A symbol which looks like a Roman balance.

R. A *Sivalingam* and below it the numerical number 13.

7. *Ob.* A bull.

R. A *chaturasramu* and the telugu numerical number 3.

8. *Ob.* A letter 'Gaṃ' referring to the Gaṅga kings.

R. A *chaturasramu* and a numerical number.

9, 10, 11, 12. *Ob.* A *Sivalingam* and other signs.

R. A *chaturasramu*.

EVOLUTION OF THE BRAHMANICAL HIERARCHY.

S. BHIMASANKARA RAO, B.A.

(Continued from page 232 of Vol. IV.)

From about the middle of the 1st century before Christ till about the 4th century A. D. we have clear evidence of inscriptions which point to the decline of Brahminism and the ascendancy of early Buddhism and the neglect of Sanskrit and the cultivation of Prakrit. But at the end of 4th century a powerful Brahminical upheaval is clearly noticeable. In the Epigraphic records, for more than five centuries past, there had not been a single grant either to Brahmins or to their Gods and Goddesses. But from about the end of the 4th century, we have quite a crop of these inscriptions and grants which continue uninterruptedly for about 12 centuries subsequently. All these were published in a collected form by Dr. Fleet as Gupta inscriptions. The worship of Siva, Vishnu and Mahāsenā seems to have been extremely popular among all classes of people from princes and chiefs to ordinary individuals. The following instances prove the same.

1 The Bhilsad inscription of Kumaragupta speaks of building (Pratoli) a gallery in the temple of Swāmi Mahāsenā by Dhruva Śarman in 414 A. D.

2 The Behar inscription represents the erection of a *Upa* sacrificial post and on the Bhetari pillar, records the installation of an image of Sarginni and the grant of a village to Brahmins by Skandagupta.

3 In the Junagadh inscription, a temple of Vishnu is spoken of as having been erected in 456 A. D. by Chakrapalita, son of Paramadatta, Skandagupta's governor of Surashtra.

4 The Indore inscription of Skandagupta records the endowment of Deva Vishnu in 464 A. D. for lighting a lamp in the temple of the sun,

5 Buddha Gupta's inscriptions state that Dhanaya Vishnu erected a *Dhwajastambham* (flagstaff) to the God Janardana.

6 The inscriptions of the minor chiefs and individuals record grants of villages to Brahmins from 474 to 509 A. D. and to the temple at Pishilipura in 527 A.D.

The universal adoption of the Sanskrit language indicates the extent of the Brahminical influence. The influence of Sanskrit Pandits upon kings and

peasants waxed greater in matters of religion and social observances. The influence of some of this Brahminical revival extended itself also to the Deccan and the Chalukyaan dynasty which established itself towards the end of the 5th century A.D. under Satyāśraya Pulikesin I. solemnised Aśvamedha sacrifice and made grants of lands to Brahmins. A cave temple of Vishnu was dedicated by Mangalesa in 578 A. D. at Bādāmi. Records of Buddhistic gifts during the period were few. The next cause of the decline of Buddhism is that Brahminism appropriated all its virtues which increased its popularity. Sanskrit was resorted to confer dignity on the religious books and the use of the learned language enhanced the prestige of Brahminism. The earlier Buddhism was eclipsed by the Mahāyāna form and the charm of *Buddha*, *Dharma* and *Samgha* was lost. For about 3 centuries before Christ there had been no powerful Brahminical princes and all the royal patronage went to Buddhism except during the time of the Sunga dynasty. That the Brahminical revival derived its full force and vigour from the royal patronage extended to it by the Gupta monarchs is clearly apparent from the large extent of the recorded gifts to Brahmins and their Gods for their daily worship and for the performance of sacrificial rites. The epigraphic records prior to the Guptas show that all royal benevolences, private and public, were bestowed upon Jain and Buddhistic institutions and that the patronage of Brahmins did not begin till the Gupta period. The effect of Asoka's propaganda was to decrease the Brahminical influence to a very low ebb until the beginning of the Gupta period when Brahmins regained their position as exponents of Indo-Aryan culture. It cannot be said that during the whole period during which Buddhism was in its ascendancy, Brahminism had altogether lost its influence but it was undergoing a steady intellectual growth. Many of Buddha's disciples were Brahmins who changed their names upon initiation as members of the *Samgha* and even in Asoka's time the Brahmins had captured its whole machinery. Brahminical or Vedic sacrificial ritual was either transformed or swept away but the ideas behind it remained as a nucleus of new spiritual growth. During all this time Brahminism retained its independent existence as a side-channel of the great stream of popular religion and within its forest *āśramas*, the basic ideas of modern Hinduism were slowly maturing. It was the disinterested labours of the Brahmin Scholars and Pandits of the Gupta period that thoroughly examined the foundations of Vedic religion and, after the course materialism of the Vedic sacrificial ritual had been purged of its grossness by Buddhistic idealism, the religion of the Vedas reunited with the main current of Indo-Aryan beliefs and the Brahmins resumed their natural position as the interpreters of Indo-Aryan religion. Buddhism, thus deprived of the intellectual support of the Aryan aristocracy, gradually relapsed to the back-ground and declined and finally became merged in the ocean of

Indian religious thought taking its place as one of the seats of Hinduism instead of a synthesis of all of them.

The Gupta monarchs were liberal patrons of Brahminical learning and the capital of the Gupta Empire was the centre of Brahminical culture and the people followed the traditions of their forefathers. After centuries of the preaching of Monasticism, the revival of Brahmanism was the natural psychological reaction and the Brahmin Guru, emerging from his forest hermitage and basking in the sunshine of royal favour, supplanted the Buddhist Bhikshus whose influence had disappeared owing to the abuse of authority and people no longer listened to the tales of Buddha's self-sacrifice but cared to hear the praise of the Aryan Kshatriya Heroes like Rama. The decline of Buddhism and its final disappearance as a separate religion was the consequence of a gradual process of intellectual absorption rather than the result of any outward pressure and persecution. The whole logical position of Buddha's philosophy was shifted and brought closely on a line with that of the Brahminical schools directly. Buddha was recognised as a personal God and Avatar of Vishnu and the development of Mahāyāna form of Buddhism is itself a splendid testimony to the revival of Brahminism.

With the patronage and encouragement given to them by the Gupta monarchs, the Brahmin Statesmen began to work by taking the popular education out of the hands of the Buddhist *Bhikshus* and shaped the whole educational policy of the Gupta period. When the Brahmins rose to power and influence under the Gupta sovereigns after centuries of neglect, it was but natural that they should consolidate their position and strengthen their influence so as to make it permanent and abiding for all time. So their object was to give a new and popular shape to the literature of their creed and re-arrange it to meet the popular tastes and to be in harmony with changed feelings of the times. Therefore, the Brahmin Pandits of the Gupta period re-edited the Mahabharata making it an encyclopaedia of hero-worship and a moral textbook containing the essence of Kshatriya polity, philosophy and religion which gave abundant material for a system of popular education. The *sāṅgha* and the *śākyās* carried it throughout the length and breadth of India and spread its message. Then again the Brahmin pandits made great endeavours to place their creed on religious and philosophical basis and to show that the creed of their opponents had no such basis. Previously all the works on religion and law existed in sacred form and in prose aphorisms and they were identified with particular schools or *śākhās* of Brahmins such as Apasthambī, Asvalayana, Boudhayana, and Katyayana who brought into existence the Kalpa sutras consisting of Śrouta sutras, Dharma sutras and Grihya sutras. All these sutras were reedited and rewritten in Anushtub metre by the Brahmin pandits of the Gupta period.

It was the age when the metrical *smritis*, *purāṇas* and *bhāṣhyas* or commentaries containing explanatory, apologetic and controversial matter began to be written and a general literary impulse was communicated to all branches of learning which culminated in an extra-ordinary outburst of an all round literary activity. In those good old times, all knowledge was imparted orally and transmitted from mouth to mouth. Subsequently *sūtras* were composed just for the purpose of remembrance as a sort of suppliment to the oral teaching. But times had been changed and it was considered necessary that there should be a plainer exposition, in a more intelligible form, of all the Aryan principles of religion so that they might be grasped and understood by all classes of people. Hence the choice of Anushtub metre in sloka form was adopted. The Brahmin scholars of Imperial Gupta court had therefore revised all the old and previously existing religious and social customs, practices and injunctions and brought out new Codes. Prominent among them was the Code of Manu which they reedited as Manusmṛiti though it was compiled some centuries back embodying the traditions of a much greater antiquity and it may be taken to represent the sociology and polity of Aryavarta during the Gupta period from 320 to 530 A.D. i.e. for full two centuries. The most significant fact is that we are now following these religious practices and injunctions which were laid down by the Brahmin Pandits of the Gupta court. The conditions of society have been greatly altered from those of the Vedic times and caste distinctions are strictly observed and the supremacy of the Brahmins as spiritual leaders, on account of their higher purity and superior knowledge of Vedic lore and wisdom, has been regarded as incontestible. Uptill Gupta period, caste was still loose and flexible and higher castes were allowed to marry into the lower and we find many instances of Brahmins taking Kshatriya and Vaisya wives such as Revakeerti and others mentioned in inscriptions. Harsha's times were the transition stage in the process of rigid fiction ending in total prohibition of marriage outside caste. None of the twice born classes were allowed to marry beyond their caste and the sacred institution of marriage was tightened in order to conserve the purity of the *varṇa* and prevent an admixture of impure blood. The diet of the Brahmins was to be strictly vegetarian except on special occasions when sacrificial meat was allowed in order to satisfy the claims of the Vedic religion. The meek change, from the meat-eating and soma-drinking Brahmin of the Vedic period to that of an absolute teetotaller in the Gupta period, shows the deep impress of Buddhistic ethics on Brahminical laws. The whole range of Hindu law has been revised and many obnoxious customs such as killing of cows at sacrifices and the practices of the lauriate were absolutely prohibited. The works on sacrificial ritual and especially the *Bhāṣhyas* on the *sūtras* must have come to be written about

this time. Since the sacrificial religion was being revived after a long time the necessity of definite authoritative ritual was keenly felt. A number of persons wrote *Bhāshyas* on the ritualistic *sūtras* and their names end in the honorific title of Swamin such as Pakshi swamin, Dhurta swamin etc. The *Purāṇas* also were recasted at this time as they felt it necessary to introduce glorifying descriptions of Gods and Goddesses whose worship was rising in popular favour for the purpose of firmly inculcating moral and religious duties. Many philosophical treatises also were brought into existence during this period by famous Vedantic schoolmen. As stated already, a general impetus was given to the cultivation of the sanskrit language which the Brahmins had fully utilized and brought into existence a large amount of literature on religion, and philosophy which is an enduring monument to their extraordinary capacity and intelligence. It was during the Gupta period that the Brahmin hierarchy wielded its greatest power and influence and became actual leaders of the people. After the Gupta Empire broke up, they lost their influence and during Sri Harsha's reign there seemed to be an equal distribution of royal patronage to all religions. Perfect toleration prevailed during Sri Harsha's reign and his historian Bāṇa records a good number of religious and philosophical disputants engaged in discussions in the debating hall of Harsha. During the latter part of Sri Harsha's reign he showed excessive favour to Buddhistic monks which greatly aroused the envy of the Brahmins who conspired to put an end to his life. The king was miraculously saved from being killed and 500 Brahmins were sent into exile for their participation in the conspiracy to murder the king. Apart from this incident which was no doubt very much exaggerated by the court-poet Bāṇa, we find from the description of Hiuen T'sang, the famous Chinese traveller and master of law that the Brahmins occupied the foremost position in society and were the leaders of the people. This is what he says regarding the Brahmins of the 7th century A-D. in his *Travels* which are translated by Mr. Mac Watters. Vide Vol I. page 141. "Among the various classes and castes of the country, the Brahmins were purest and most esteemed. From their excellent reputation, the name 'Brahmin's country' had come to be a popular one in India. The Brahmins keep to their priceless principles strictly observing ceremonial purity". Such was the glowing testimony paid to the Brahmin caste by an impartial foreigner though belonging to the rival cult of Buddhism. How much has the average Brahmin of the present day degenerated from his prototype in the 7th century! But yet the consolation is that we have not lost Brahminism altogether though keeping its semblance. There were not sectarian distinctions among the Brahmins of the 7th century and all belonged to one single sect having no subdivisions. The innumerable subdivisions and subjects into which Brahmins are divided at the present day,

had not come into existence during the 7th century. The 10 sects (i.e) Pancha-dandas and Pancha-gondas which were originally based more on territorial distinctions have come into vogue during subsequent centuries. There were no doubt distinctions, such as Rik śākha, Yajus śākha and so on. The Brahmins were known more by the name of their *gōtra* and *pravara* to which they belonged than by any other distinct appellation.

Bāṇa's description of himself is confined to his stating that he belonged to Vatsayana Gotra. We also find from inscriptions and copper plate grants that Brahmins were described by their *gōtra* and *śākha* alone and not by any of the present modes. It would appear also that these Brahmins belonging to Rigveda were styled as Bahrrichas. Sāmavedis were known as Chandagas and Yejurvedis were known as Vajasaneyas. Such was the position of the Brahmins in the 7th century. During the 9th century Brahminism had acquired a great religious influence and power by the advent of the Great Sri Sankarāchārya whose philosophical teachings extirpated altogether the remnants of Buddhist faith in India. The Brahmin orthodoxy gained a high reputation and the discussion conducted by this great Sanyasin greatly redounded to their prestige. When Sankarācharya challenged the Pandits of Buddhism in the philosophical arena, he did not put forward any new religion or new doctrine but maintained the original position of Brahmin orthodoxy as laid down in Upanishads, Brahmasutras and Gita. He easily threw overboard his Buddhistic opponents and won great distinction in the debating halls of the Benares University and had a right royal reception at all the courts of the kings of Northern India. He founded an Order of Sanyasins, open to all castes after the model of Buddhistic *Sangha* and established many *Mutts* in many places the chief of which is the Sringeri Mutt in Southern India held in great veneration, respect and devotion by all the Brahmin disciples. If Buddhism disappeared from the land of its birth, it was because of the crushing defeats which Sankarācharya had inflicted upon the Buddhists in the debating halls of Aryavarta by his superior intellectual powers of debate, rhetoric and eloquence coupled with solid reason.

After Sankarācharya, we have Ramanuja and Madhwa who propounded their respective theories according to Brahmasutras, Upanishads and Gita and obtained adherents for their systems of philosophy. We have come to the close of our historical enquiry with regard to the Brahmin hierarchy. Even now the Brahmin priesthood is still leading in all social and religious matters and its services are eagerly requisitioned by all classes of people including the great bulk of Non-brahmins though a few westernised and English-educated of them are raising the standard of revolt against Brahminism and accusing it for keeping them down still in the lowest scale and withholding from them all special spiritual

knowledge. Having examined the history of the origin, growth and development of the Brahmin priesthood from the ancient times we can easily see that there is absolutely no foundation for this accusation levelled against the Brahmin. We have seen that, in the ancient times and during the Vedic period, many tribes were unable to conform to the Aryan laws and customs and consequently went out of the Aryan pale. They were unable to live a life of severe discipline like the Brahmins of old and conform to the rules of the Aryan society. They refused to perform the sacrifices enjoined by the Aryan law and hence they were voluntarily out and denied to suit themselves to, and be bound by, the Aryan laws. Many of the tribesmen failed to perform the duties enjoined upon an Aryan householder such as keeping daily-fire, offering oblations, performing new moon and full moon sacrifices and such other things and were unable to lead a life of severe personal discipline.

A few of the tribesmen specialised themselves in these matters and devoted their life-time for the study and cultivation of the principles of Brahminical religion and practice owing to other occupations. Others did not care to cultivate the ancient Brahminical virtues.

Had some of the remotest ancestors of the present-day Non-Brahmins in those Vedic and Epic times submitted themselves to the rigorous Brahminical pursuits, they would have been also Brahmins now and the present-day Non-Brahmins could only accuse their remotest ancestors of ancient times in not following the Brahminical principles but pursuing other avocations. As for the Non-Brahmins being kept out of the portals of all knowledge, it is a flagrant historical untruth and many instances could be quoted to prove that there were Non-Brahmins in ancient, medieval and modern times who could hold their own as against the Brahmin in point of culture and knowledge and the name of Vidura of the epic times may be mentioned to refute this modern heresy. During the 7th and the 8th centuries A.D., the Saiva revivalists of the South in the Pandya kingdom who were all profound philosophers were Non-Brahmins and expounded their theories of Saiva Siddhanta. The chief philosophical exponents of Saiva revivalism of the 7th and the 8th centuries led by Nankka Vachagar and his successors were all Non-Brahmins. For the first time in the 20th century, this cry is raised and never before during the past centuries that the Brahmin kept the Non-Brahmin down in ignorance. It is more an accusation levelled against the Brahmin on account of the present day struggle for existence chiefly owing to economic conditions in these modern times rather than any statement of truth. It has no historical foundation to support it.

Let me conclude: The future of Brahminism does not appear to be bright. The Brahmin had raised a host of enemies all round and is

the target of all criticism, ridicule and obloquy. But he cannot be dispensed with as he fulfils an important function in Society. That he has degenerated greatly and has abandoned many of the old Brahminical virtues goes without saying but he is not responsible for it as it is due to the working of the time-spirit. It is a pity he cannot escape it.

But centuries of hereditary tradition and equipment would always enable him to maintain his frontal rank and position among the people notwithstanding the present temporary opposition and certainly to continue to lead the people as the chief exponent of the Indo-Aryan civilization and culture.

COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF AKASLAKHAVARAM

SRI SRI SRI LAKSHMINARAYANA HARICHENDAN JAGADEB

The village of Akasalakhavaram is in Tekkali Taluk to the east side near the sea coast. This village is near the village of Bommali. In the village of Akasalakhavaram, a certain farmer while digging the foundations to construct a house, got a Copper Plate and the same has been secured by me. The length of the Plate is $7\frac{1}{4}$ ", whereas the breadth is $1\frac{1}{4}$ ". It is as thick as a Copper coin. This is only a single Plate. This Plate has been engraved on both sides in Telugu and Oriya characters. On the first side there have been engraved five lines and on the second side seven lines. There was engraved a part of Vyasa sloka on the second side of the Plate. As the engraver of the Plate is not well up in writing Telugu and Oriya languages, there are certain mistakes in the Plate; but the letters engraved are nowhere spoiled and they are very clear to read. The script is that of the middle age i.e. of the Mohamadan period, but it is not ancient script,

READING OF THE INSCRIPTION.

First Side.

- 1 నలనామసంవృత్సర జేష్ఠ బ ౧౩ సో॥ నాడు శలవాక భీముడుకు కీర్తి
- 2 పాతృడు, అనంతు వెంక్కటనారాయణ, కాశిపాతృడు, సదాశివ
- 3 వెంక్కయ్య, హరీపాతృ(డు) మొదలయి బామ్మభీదేశస్తులు వ్రాయించి
- 4 యిచ్చిన యినాంపట్టా కసుబామ్మభీలో పొందరి పెరల్లగుడ్డ దిగ
- 5 వా పల్లం మూడుగరిశెలున్న పాలగుడ్డవద్ద మెట్టుగరిశెనున్న

Second Side.

- 1 కూడాగరనాలుగుగరి(శె)లు శేఖుసాపేబుశలవ్రహ్మకారంగ్గా మేము వ్రాయించి
- 2 చ్చి యిప్పి సమిగన్గ ఫలపరుచుకోని మీపుత్రపాత్రప్రతియంతం అనుభ
- 3 (వి)స్తావుండెది॥ స్వదత్తద్విగుణ్యం పరదత్తానుపాలనం॥
- 4 కృణాపాత్ర సమ్మత ॥ అనంతసహ వేకదన్ గా (య) గా స ॥
- 5 ఒక్కయ (1) రురీ ॥ కాసోపాత్ర సహ సహ
- 6 యామన్యనికి కట్టుబడి రు ౧౨ పన్నెండురూపాయలు॥

TRANSLATION OF THE INSCRIPTION.

On monday, the 13th day of new moon in the month of Jeshta of Nalanāma samvatsara, Krishna Patrudu, Anantu Venkatanarayana, Kasi Patrudu, Sadasiva Venkayya, and Haripatrudu granted to one Salavaka Bhimudu an Inam of four *garces* of land in Bommali, of which three *garces* of wet land lay to the south of Pondari backyards and one *garce* of dry land in a portion of dry land called Palagudde, under the orders of Sheik Saheb to be enjoyed permanently until his des-cendents exist after paying Kattubadi tax of Rs 12 per year

N. B. The Sheik Saheb mentioned in the above Plate might be the Nawab of Chicacole. Under this Nawab there were also Bommali Taluk and a part of the eastern portion of the Tekkali Taluk to the sea-side and also a part of the southern portion of the Tekkali Taluk. These plots might have been split up into certain portions and ruled by 1. Krishna Patrudu 2 Anantu Venkatnarayana 3. Kasipatrudu 4. Sadasiva Venkayya and 5, Haripatrudu as subordinates of Sheik Saheb of Chicacole. As the signatures of these individuals are in Oriya it can be said that all these were Karnams. By this Copper-Plate it is clear that there were Copper-Plate grants during the period of Mohammadans. As there is a part of Vyasagita in the Copper-Plate, it is clear that, though these Donors are the subordinates of the Nawab, they have got Hindu manners and customs.

THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN GĀNGAS OF KALINGA.

R. SUBBA RAO. M.A., L.T.

Chapter II.


(Continued from page 199 above.)

Origin and Early History of the Eastern and the Western Gāṅgas— The Earlier and the Later E. Gāṅgas—The Gāṅga Era—Kaliṅganagara.

The Gāṅgas, who were mentioned, in the Greek and Roman writings of the period extending from the fourth century B. C. to the second century A.D., as a Gangetic tribe living in the Gangetic Delta and a part of Bengal and Bihar¹ under the rule of the Nandas and the Mauryas, are next referred to in inscriptions as living independently in the southern part of Mysore from the second century A.D. to the eleventh century A.D. Their country was termed Gāṅgavāḍi and their early capital Kuvalāla. Though several copper-plate grants of the Gāṅgas of Mysore, belonging to the third and the fourth centuries A. D., are published they do not reveal, like the many published C.P. grants of the E. Gāṅgas of Kalinga, full and detailed account of the origin and the early history of the dynasty. We must therefore look for these into the later Inscriptions, written on copper plates in the case of the E. Gāṅgas of Kalinga, and on stones in the case of the W. Gāṅgas of Mysore. Stone inscriptions of the 11th and


¹ In Ptolemy's Map of India published opposite to p. 329 in Ind. Ant. vol. XIII the Gangaride are shown as living at the mouth of the Ganges in the Deltaic portion. Their royal city was Gange. It is described in Periplus as a great commercial centre on the Ganges. Along with the Prasii, they lived on the eastern bank of the Ganges. Pliny calls them Gens Novissima. They are also termed Gangaridae calingae and they had a powerful military force. The Sundarbans and a large part of Bengal and Bihar were occupied by them. St. Martin thinks that Parthalis, said to be their capital by Pliny, is only Vardhana or Burdwan. Their name is still preserved in the aboriginal tribes. Goughs of Bihar and Gongayis of N. W. Bengal. (p. 365 Ind. Ant. vol. 13) To the north of them lived the Maroundai or Munda tribe and to the west lived the Ganganoi or Tangana race (Ibid pp. 376—377). Tosali (capital of Kalinga in Asoka's time), Triglipton or Trilingon (The Telugu name and language are fixed by Pliny and Ptolemy near the mouths of the Ganges or between the Ganges and the Godavari. Ibid p. 383) and Dandagula (It is identified by several scholars with Dantapura ruins near Chikakole Ry. Station, Ganjam Dt.) are all mentioned as great cities in Kalinga.

the 12th centuries, discovered in the Nagar and Shimoga Taluks of Mysore, give the following geneology and history of the Gaṅgas of Mysore²—




The Jain Āchārya Simhanāndi seems to have helped them in founding a kingdom called Gaṅgavāḍi with the capital at Kuvalāla. They are said to belong to Kānvāyanagōtra. They subdued Bana and Konkara countries. Their rule commenced in the first-half of the second century A.D. They built *Chaityālayas* for Jain monks.

The geneology and the early history of the Eastern Gaṅgas, are thus given in the copper-plate grants of Anantavarma Chōḍagaṅga dated Śaka years 1034 and 1040³—



² Vide Insc. No. 35 of Nagar Taluk and Nos. 4, 10, 64 of Shimoga. Also Pp. 29—32 in *Mysore and Coorg* by B. L. Rice.

³ Vide J.A.H.R.S. vol. I, Pp. 106—124 and Ind. Ant. vol. 18, p. 165.



It would also appear from the above inscriptions that Kāmārṇava I was the Founder of the Kalinga Gaṅga Line. He left his country Gaṅgavādi to his paternal uncle who usurped the same and with his four brothers set out to Mahēndragiri in the East. Having there worshipped God Gōkarnaswāmi and having obtained the crest of a bull and the insignia of universal

sovereignty, he got down the hill with his brothers, conquered Sabalā(rā)-ditya and took possession of the Kalinga countries, and ruled from his capital Dantapuram. He made Dānārṇava the crown prince, and gave Ambavādivishaya to Guṇārṇava, Sōdāmaṇḍala to Mārasimha and Kantakavartani to Vajrahasta. He thus ruled for 35 years and was succeeded by Dānārṇava who ruled for 40 years. Then his son Kāmārṇava II ruled for 50 years with his capital at Nagara where he built a lofty temple for Śiva in the *linga* form and named it Madhukēśa. His son, Rānārṇava for 5 years and then his son Vajrahasta II for 15 years ruled.

From the foregoing account it is clear that the Gaṅga tribe was so-called because it lived on the banks of the Ganges, and was a Northern tribe that originally dwelt in the Gangetic Delta, Bengal and Bihar but gradually spread into the Kalinga country in the East and ruled over it. The Later Western Gaṅga plates would make us believe that while Bhāgadatta went to rule over Kalinga, his brother's Line, after ruling over the ancestral Gaṅgavādi in the north, was defeated by the ruler of Malwa and forced to found a new kingdom, named after the ancestral one, in Mysore, in the south. This Mysore Dynasty endured independently from the third century A. D. to the tenth century A. D. The break-up of the Andhra Empire probably facilitated this course. In Kalinga, however, the Kalinga Gaṅgas remained probably subordinate till the break-up of the Gupta Empire at the close of the fifth century A. D., when they became independent. Under the Nandas, Mauryas, Chedis, Andhras and Guptas who are all known to have ruled over Kalinga which was one of the provinces in their Empire, the Gaṅgas remained tributary. It is only from the close of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth century, as attested by the presence of their several Plates published so far, that they became a Sovereign Power. The historical as well as the palaeographical grounds revealed in the two published Plates⁴ of Indravarma and Prithvīmūla would confirm the same conclusion. The fact that no mention is made of the Earlier Gaṅga kings in the geneologies contained in the grants of the Later Gaṅga kings is to be explained as being due to the Later kings' having lost all knowledge of the history of the Earlier kings. This view receives support from the fact that the geneology (given above) in some Plates of Anantavarma Chodagaṅga does not tally with that given in those of his grandfather Vajrahasta, and further with that given in some of his own.⁵ This is due to the fact that the traditions of the whole Line from the beginning were not kept up fully or remembered correctly. Some scholars like Dr. Fleet identified, while editing the Plates of the Later E. Gaṅga kings, Gāṅgavādi and Kōlāhalapuram mentioned in them, with the kingdom

⁴ Vide *The Jirjangi C.P. Grant of Indravarma* in J.A.H.R.S. vol. III, part 1 and the *Goḍavari Plates of Prithvīmūla* in J. Bo. B. R. A. S. vol. XVI p. 118.

⁵ Vide *Ep. Ind.* vols. III p. 222, IV p. 183, IX p. 94 and XI p. 147. Also, *Ind. Ant.* vol. XVIII pp. 161—165 and 172—176. Also, pp. 50—55 in the *Supplement to Kalingadesa Charitra* edited by me in Telugu.

of the same name founded in Mysore by W. Gangas, early in the third century A.D. and its capital Kuvalālapuram. But these identifications are wrong. Now, from the Plates of the E. Gaṅga kings, it is clearly known that the ancestral kingdom was called Gaṅgavādi or the land of the Gaṅgas. When one Line of the Gaṅgas migrated *to the South*, they naturally called their new kingdom after their old one in the north. Similarly, when another Line marched *to the East*, they created a kingdom and called it also after their old one in the north. In the Plates of Anantavarma Chōdaganga, Kāmārṇava I, the founder of the E. Gaṅga line, is described as leaving Gaṅgavādi and *going to the East* showing thereby that his ancestral kingdom of Gaṅgavādi lay *to the (North) West and not to the South*⁶. Similarly, he is described as referring to Kōlāhalapura and not to Kuvalālapura of Mysore. There is mention made actually of a Kōlāhalapura, situated in the Ganjam District,⁷ as being the capital of Prithivivarmadeva, a king of Kalinga Gaṅga Line. Hence, it must be known that the Gaṅgas of Kalinga were a *northern race* who had little to do with the Gaṅgas of Mysore, at any rate, after they left the ancestral home of Gaṅgavādi in the north and migrated to Mysore in the south.

This conclusion receives good support from the following facts:—

1. While the Early Gaṅga Kings of Mysore were Jains and belonged to Ikshvāku dynasty and Solar Line and professed Kanvāyana *gotra*, all the Earlier as well as several Later Gaṅga kings of Kalinga were ardent worshippers of Paramēśvara (Śiva) and belonged to Lunar Line and professed Atrēya *gotra*.
2. In the Copper-plate Grants of the Later Gaṅga kings of Kalinga, there is no mention made that they migrated from Mysore in the south, Nor do we find any resemblance between the names of the kings found therein and those found in the inscriptions of the Mysore Gaṅga kings.
3. While the Seals of the Grants of the Mysore Gaṅgas and Kadambas contain the emblems of elephant and lion respectively, those of the Kalinga Gaṅgas and Kadambas contain bull and fish respectively.
4. While the Gaṅgas and the Kadambas of Mysore were related to each other, the Gaṅgas and the Kadambas of Kalinga were also related to each other. And it is known, from the existence of Gaṅga and Kadamba villages and clans in Orissa feudatory states even at the present day that these tribes gradually settled in various parts of the country and gave their ancestral name to them. While one Line migrated to Kalinga and another to Mysore, more adventurous branches founded independent kingdoms in Ceylon and East Indies.

6 Strictly stating the Gangas of Mysore must be called the *Southern Gangas*

7 Vide Prithivivarma deva's Ganjam plates edited in Ep. Ind. Vol. 4 No. 28

The Earlier and the Later Eastern Gaṅgas.

Some scholars have stated⁸ that the Earlier and the Later Gaṅgas belong to different Lines but this is wrong. They contend that the Earlier Gaṅgas in their charters used the Gaṅga Era (Gaṅgāyavathsa Pravarddhamāna Vijayarājya Samvatsara), while the Later Gaṅgas used the Śāka Era and so they belong to different Lines. But this contention holds no ground because the Gaṅga Kings, both Earlier and Later, used an Era of their own consistent with their independent position till a later time, (about 1000 A.D) when they gave it up and adopted the S'āka Era just as it was customarily done at that time by kings of other dynasties also in S. India. A King called Madhukāmārjuna who is claimed in all the C.P. grants of the so-called Later Gaṅga Kings as belonging to their Line actually refers to the year 526 of the Gaṅga Era in one of his own C.P. grants recently discovered⁹. This shows that the practice was continued by kings of the Later Line and ultimately some king of it gave it up for the S'āka Era. It is possible that this was done, as in the Eastern Chalukya Line, at the close of 10 century A. D. and the earliest Grant published so far¹⁰ which shows the change belongs to the time of Anantavarma Vajrahasta whose accession is said to have taken place in S'āka 901.

There are also other points urged by the scholars. It is stated that the kings who used the Gaṅga Era gave short genealogies only unlike the Later Kings. But this is as it ought to be, for, during the early times, when the earlier kings lived and ruled, it was the custom to trace the genealogy to one or two generations only and this was the case with the Early Pallavas, Salankayanas, Vishnukundins and E. Chalukyas. It is only later on, probably in the 11th century, that kings of the several dynasties of South India vied with one another in tracing lengthy genealogies and connecting themselves with the Solar and Lunar dynasties mentioned in the Epics.

Then again, it is stated that the Earlier Kings have no *Gotra* of their own mentioned in their Grants while the Later ones are mentioned as belonging to Atrēya *Gotra*. But it should be remembered that the Earlier Gaṅgas are said to belong to Gaṅgānvaya or Gaṅgāmalakula in their grants and who knows that it is not also their *Gotra* like the Śālankāyana *gotra* of the kings of that dynastic name who ruled over Vēṅgi Maṇḍala in the fourth and in the fifth centuries AD. Even granting that it was not their *gotra* and that they did not observe *gotra* like the Rashtrakuta, Pratihara and other Medieval dynastic kings, it only proves that there were certain Kshatriya dynasties who, by Custom and *Śāstra*

⁸ Sewel's *Antiquities of S. India* pp. 155—159; Burnell's S. I, *Palaeography* p. 68 N. 4.

⁹ Vide C.P. No. 5 in the Ep. Report of S. Circle for 1916—1919.

¹⁰ Vide J.B.O.R.S. vol. 17 pp. 175—183.

were exempted from the use of it. In such cases, they adopted the *Gotra* of their *Purohita* or Priests as their own. Also, it was the custom for the kings having no *Gotra* to belong to *Atrēya gotra*. It is that way probably that Later Gaṅgas are said to belong to *Atrēya gotra* in their charters.

There are many evidences to prove that the Earlier and the Later Gaṅgas belonged to one and the same family:—

1. The names 'Gāṅga' and 'Gaṅga' are both found in the Grants of the kings of both Lines and so they are applicable equally to them, so that it need not be construed that Gāṅga Line is different from Gaṅga Line,

2. The suffixes to the names of kings of both Lines, such as Varma, Deva, and Arṇava, are found to be the same.

3. The Capital or royal residence of kings of both Lines is said to be Kalinganagara. In each case, another chief-town, Dantapura, is also mentioned.

4. The kings of both Lines worshipped the Holy feet of Gōkarnēśvara of Mahendra-giri. They worshipped Siva until Later kings followed the worship of Vishnu after the transfer of the capital to Cuttack in the 12th century.

5. The kings of both Lines were closely related to the Eastern Kadambas who were employed under them as Provincial governors and who were generally the Executors of their Grants.

6. The Seals of the Grants adopted by the kings of both Lines resemble closely. They contain the same emblems like Lotus, Crescent, Bull and Elephant-goad.

7. The style of beginning the Grants in both cases is also similar. The Parlakimidi plates of the time of Vajrahastā begin in the same way as those of the Early Gaṅga Kings, Dēvēndravarma, Satyavarma and Indravarma.

Thus, the common family name Gāṅga or Gaṅga, the titles of kings as recorded in their Grants, the God Gokarnēśvara seated on Mahendragiri and worshipped by kings of both Lines, the same Capital Kalinganagaram from which both sets of grants were generally issued, the common relationship referred to in both sets of Grants with the E. Kadambas and other common particulars, point to one and the same conclusion viz, that the Early and the Later Gaṅgas belong to the same Dynasty.

The Gaṅgāyavamsa Samvatsara, or the Gaṅga Era.

All the inscriptions of the Early Gaṅga kings discovered so far including Madhukāmārṇava's, which probably belong to the period AD. 500 to 1000 AD, are found inscribed on copper-plates only and they number nearly twenty-five. In all these C.P. grants, the kings describe themselves as belonging to Gaṅgāmālakula, i.e. the pure clan of the Gaṅgas and this is probably intended to distinguish the indiginousness and the purity of

their tribe as against the mixed and the *mleccha* or foreign character, of the other Indian ruling tribes of the period. Similarly, they used an Era of their own which is differently termed in the several grants. Thus, the terms, Gaṅgēyavarṁsa Pravardhamāna Vijaya Rājya Saṁvatsara (the year of the augmenting victorious rule of the Gaṅga Line), Pravarddhamāna Vijaya rājya saṁvatsara, (the year of the augmenting victorious rule) Vijaya rājya saṁvatsara, (the year of the victorious rule), Pravarddhamāna rājya saṁvatsara, (the year of the augmenting rule), Pravarddhamāna saṁvatsara, (the augmenting year), and Gaṅgēya varṁsa saṁvatsara (the year of the Gaṅga Line), all appear. Though they appear in so many different forms we may take it that they all refer to an Era of the E. Gaṅgas called the Gaṅga Era. It is significant that while the Chalukyas of the Dekkan and the Kadambas and the Gangas of Mysore used the *Sāka Varsha*, the E. Gaṅgas adopted the Gaṅga *saṁvatsara* probably to emphasise the purity and the individuality of their Line. It is peculiarly noteworthy that of all the dynasties that ruled over various parts of India, this Dynasty alone preserved its individuality and independence for over nine long centuries i.e., from A.D. 500 to A. D. 1434. The Gaṅga Era, like the other Eras of the times, denotes the foundation independently of a powerful kingdom and in my view, the Gaṅgas became independent in Kalinga soon after the fall of the Gupta Empire at the close of the 5th century just like the Valabhis in Malwa, the Maukharis in Bihar and the Chalukyas in the Dekkan. At the time of Samudragupta's invasion, about 340 A.D. Kalinga was divided into several small divisions over which petty chiefs ruled. They were defeated by him but again restored to their places on their becoming tributary. So long as the Gupta Empire lasted, the situation must have remained the same but after its downfall, the E. Gaṅgas rose and asserted their independence and started in token of it, an Era of their own. The earliest kings did not refer to the Gaṅga Era. But Maharajah Devendravarma, son of Anantavarma and his son Maharajah Satyavarma were the first kings that expressly referred to the fifty-first year of the Ganga Era in their C.P. grants and this practice was continued by their successors. Hastivarma of 80 G. E., and Indravarma of 87 and 91 G. E. claimed, in their inscriptions, to have conquered the whole of Kalinga (Sakala Kalinga) and taken up the title of (Rajasimha) Lion of Kings and to have firmly established the Gaṅga Dynasty in Kalinga. Possibly, the Ganga king Indravarma who is the Donor of the Jirjingi plates of 35th year (G.E.) and who alone has the title of '*Frikalingādhipathi*' among all the Early Gaṅga kings, might be the Founder of the Dynasty.

Unfortunately, the starting point of the Era has long remained a matter of discussion and doubt. In their Grants, the kings simply referred to the Gaṅga year and the *punya kalāms* such as solar and lunar eclipses, the Vishuva and the Uttarāyana Sankrāntis, the months, the *pakshas* and the *tithis* but not to the names of years which alone would enable scholars

successfully to equate the Gaṅga year with the corresponding Christian or Śāka year.¹¹

However, Scholars like Dr. Fleet depended upon the astronomical dāta, given only imperfectly in the Grants, though they also relied at the same time on Palaeography which is rather an uncertain hand-maid of history and on Synchronism which is suggested in Prithvimula's Godavari Plates. In editing Indravarma's C. P. Grant of the Gaṅga year 128 he stated thus¹²:—"It is possible that this king is identical with the *Adhiraja* Indra, who is mentioned in the Godavari Plates of Raja Prithvimula as combining with other chiefs and overthrowing a certain Indrabhattāraka who must be the E. Chalukya king of that name (A.D. 660) and that it is the period to which this and the two grants of 146 (it is really 138) and 91 may be allotted on palaeographical grounds and "on account of the use of numerical symbols in the date and the omission to specify the lunar fortnight of the month; and with this to start with, the mention of the eclipse of the moon may perhaps serve, on calculation, to determine the date of the grant exactly." Again, while noticing the grant of Devendravarma on p. 274, in the same volume, he wrote thus: "I have already suggested that, on historical as well as palaeographical grounds, Indravarma of 128 and 146 (138) may be referred to about Śāka 579 to 582 (A.D. 657-660). Taking 136 as the mean between the two certain dates of Indravarma and taking this as equivalent to Śāka 580, this would bring Devendravarma to about Śāka 696 (A.D. 774-775). And this is about the latest period to which, on palaeographical grounds, the grant of the year 254 can be referred".

Finally, however, while editing the Parlakimidi Plates¹³ of Maharajah Indravarma of 91st year, he remarked that the Indra of the Chicacole grant of 128 year may be the grandson of the Indra of these Plates "and as regards the Era, it is Gangeya Era but *its epoch still remains to be determined*..... and it is possible that the Indra who defeated Indrabhattāraka may be this king in which case the lunar eclipse mentioned in the grant of 128 year should be looked to in the period 627-725 A.D. for its precise determination."

11 While noticing the C.P. grants of Indravarma, son of Dānarnava in S.I. Ep Report for 1913-1914, p. 71, Dr. L. D. Swamikannu Pillai remarked that the particulars of time noted in the Grant would not be sufficient to fix up the regnal period of the king in terms of Christian or Śāka years. Similarly, Dr. Hultsch while editing the C.P. grant of Devendravarma, son of Gunarnava wrote thus:—"Unfortunately neither of the two dates (noted in the grant) contains any elements which admit of verification and which might thus help to fix the initial point of Gangeya Era."

12 Ind. Ant. vol. XIII Pp. 119-122. 13 Ind. Ant. vol. XVI Pp. 131-134.

This last hint thrown out by Dr. Fleet was thoroughly examined by Mr. G. Ramdos, B.A., who finally found¹⁴ that none of the eclipses recorded in the Gaṅga plates fell during the period suggested by Dr. Fleet.

However, he put forward his own views based on historical and palaeographical grounds. Firstly, because Samudragupta conquered Kalinga in 349—350 A.D., he would have freed it from out of the hands of the Pishtapura kings who formerly ruled over it and granted it to the E. Gaṅgas who consequently called their Era, the Year of the Victorious rule, which therefore began in 349—350 A.D.

Secondly, comparing the alphabet of the plates of the E. Gaṅgas with that of the Gupta and Kalachuri grants, he came to the conclusion that the initial year of the Gaṅga Era should be placed between the years 349 A.D. and 350 A.D.

But both these arguments fall to the ground. It is impossible to believe that the Guptas would have allowed the Gaṅgas to found an Era of their own during the zenith of their power which lasted till the close of the 5th century A.D. It is equally unsafe to rely on the palaeographical comparison as it is not by itself a sure and safe handmaid of history.¹⁵ Among the Gaṅga plates themselves, those of 51st year were considered to be later than those of the 254th year by a comparison of the characters only.

While Dr. Fleet stated that Indravarma of 87 and 91 G.E. should be considered as having fought with Indrabhattāraka of the E. Chalukya Line who lived in A.D. 663. Dr. Kielhorn suggested that the same Gaṅga king should be considered as having fought with Indrabhattāraka of the Vishnukūṇḍin Line. This suggestion was accepted by Dr. Dubreuil¹⁶ who further stated that the Gaṅga Indra of 87 and 91 years might have surely fought with the Vishnukūṇḍin Indrabhattāraka in the beginning of the sixth century. But he claimed the victory for the Vishnukūṇḍin king as against the express statement to the contrary contained in Prithvimula's Godavari Plates¹⁷. Prithvimula, son of Prabhākara, in his 25th regnal year issued an order from Kāṇḍālī to the Rāshtrakuta chiefs of the District of Tāḷupāka granting the village of Chūyipāka situated amidst the four villages of Viḷendi, Renguta, Kamparu and Tukura. *The grant was made at the instance of King Indra, the conqueror of Indrabhattāraka.* Indrabhattāraka, the Donor of the Rāmatirtham grant who belonged to the

14 J. B. O. R. S. vol. IX parts 3 and 4, Pp. 398—415. "*Chronology of the Early Ganga kings of Kalinga*"

15 For a fuller discussion of the subject Vide my *Note on the Gaṅgeya Era and the E. Gaṅga Chronology* published in J.A.H.R.S. Vol II. Pt 2, Pp 153—164. It is found necessary now to revise it in some places owing to new Plates since discovered.

16 *Ancient History of the Dekkan* pp. 76 and 91,

17 J. Pom. Br. R.A.S. Vol 16, pp. 116,

Vishnukundin dynasty was the ruler of South Kalinga (Visag and Godavari Districts) and Vengi about the period AD 500-530. He is described in the Grant as having defeated in hundred thousands of battles several four-tusked elephants (Airāvatas of Indra). The Godavari plates also state that Indraraja, seated on his elephant *Supratika* and heading a powerful confederacy of princes struck down the elephant *Kumuda* on which Indrabhattāraka was seated. Now, *Supratika* is the name of the elephant of North-Eastern region and *Kumuda* is the name of the elephant of South-Western region. It is clear therefore that King Indravarma of N. E. region, i.e., North Kalinga defeated Indrabhattāraka of S. W. region, i.e., South Kalinga and Vengi. Probably South Kalinga formed the bone of contention between the two kings and ultimately king Indra of Gaṅga Line succeeded in wresting it from out of the Vishnukundin Kings's hands. Therefore only, the Chikkulla plates of his successor, Vikramēndravarma, mention Lendalur or modern Dendalur near Vēngi as the capital of the Vishnukundin dynasty, though the Ramatirtham plates mention Puranisangam in Visag Dt. as the Capital. Evidently, the Gaṅga king succeeded in pushing his Vishnukundin rival across the Godavari.

Since this Vishnukundin Indrabhattāraka ruled from AD. 500 to 530, it follows, according to the statements of Drs. Kielhorn and Dubreuil, that the Gaṅga Indra of 87 and 91 G. E. lived and ruled at the same time and so the Gaṅga Era would begin about 440 A.D. But this is not so. The discovery of five new inscriptions has thrown considerable new light on this difficult problem.

Of these, the Jirjingi Grant of Indravarma of 39 G. E. is the most important.¹⁸ The king is termed *Trikalingāthipati* (Lord of the Three Kalingas), a title which is not met with in any of the Gaṅga grants upto the time of Vajrahasta. (Śāka 960). The letters are box-headed and therefore belong to the beginning of the 6th century A. D. The king is also described as 'the victor in several battles of four-tusked elephants' and 'the thousand-fold Sun in the sky of pure Gaṅga family'. In my opinion, it is this king that is referred to in Prithvimula's Godavari Plates as having defeated the Vishnukundin Indrabhattāraka. If so, his 39th year would synchronise with A.D. 530 or the *Gaṅga Era would begin about 490 A.D.*

The second important Grant is that of Madhukāmārṇava of G.E. 526.¹⁹ Like his immediate successor Vajrahasta whose accession took place in S 960, he too granted some villages to Vaisyas. According to the geneology and chronology contained in Vajrahasta's plates which are approved by all

18 J.A.H.R.S. vol III. part I. pp. 49-53.

19 C.P. No. 3 in the An. Report on S.I. Ep for 1918-1919,

scholars as historical and trustworthy unlike some of those contained in the Grants of his grandson Anantavarma Chōḍa Gaṅga,²⁰ Madhukāmārṇava ruled from AD 1019 to 1037. If the Madhukāmārṇava of G. E 526 is, as I have taken, the same as this king who ruled from AD. 1019 to 1037, then, *the Gaṅga Era would begin about 493 A.D.*, assuming that the king made his grant in the first year of his accession.

The third important Grant is the Pulimburu C. P. grant of Mādhavavarma III.²¹ It was discovered along with a C. P. grant of Jayasimha I²² of the Eastern Chalukya Line who ruled from AD. 633 to 663 and who granted the same village of Pulimburu to the son of the donee of the Grant of Mādhavavarma. From this fact, it has been possible to fix the close of Mādhavavarma's rule as falling in the *beginning* of 7th century A.D. The importance of the grant lies in the fact that it was made while crossing the river Godavari *with a view to conquer the Eastern region, ie, Kalinga*. This shows that Kalinga which was under Vishnukundin rule in the time of Indrabhaṭṭāraka passed into the hands of the E. Gaṅgas and hence the necessity of this invasion. The regnal periods of Indrabhaṭṭāraka and his Gaṅga contemporary Indra I of G.E. 39 could also be roughly fixed as falling in the first quarter of the 6th century A.D. From this, *it follows that the Gaṅga Era started about 490 A. D.*

✓ The fourth important inscription is the Simhapura Copper-plate Grant of the Kadamba king Dharmakheḍi of the Gaṅga-Kadamba year 520.²³ Dharmakheḍi is described as the Mahāmaṇḍalika of Dēvēndrabrahma (varma), son of Anantabrahma (varma) of the E. Gaṅga family. From his capital Jayantipura, in Mahēndrabhōga *vishaya* (Modern Mandasa Zamindari in Ganjam District) he ruled over five districts with the title of Mahēndrādhīpati. (Lord of Mt. Mahendra). In Gaṅga-Kadambavamsā pravarddhamāna Vijayarāja Samvatsara Panchaśatavimsōttarē, 520, he granted the village of Dharmmapura in Mahēndrabhōga to two Vedic Brahmins. The Gaṅga-Kadamba Era may rightly be identified with the Gaṅga Era as the Kadambas were the feudatories of the Gaṅgas and as they referred in loyal terms to their Suzerains in all their grants. In this Grant, a short genealogy of the Kadamba Donors and their Gaṅga Suzerains is given as follows:—

20 Ep. Ind. Vol. IV, p. 183.

21 *Telugu Bharati* vol 7 No. 9 and vol 8 No 2, J.A.H.R.S. vol VI. part I, pp 17-24

22 J.A.H.R.S. Vol IV. parts I&II, pp. 72—76

23 J.A.H.R.S. vol. III, Pp. 171—180. Mr. Satyanarayan Rajguru who published the grant has given a good account of the Kadambas but his view that the *beginnings of the Ganga Era were about the period 655—661 A.D.* is open to serious objection.

Niyārnava

Bhāma Khēḍi

Dharmakhēḍi

Anantavarma

Devendravarma

It appears from the above grant that Dharmakhēḍi of G.K. Era 520 lived in the reign of Devendravarma.

Lastly, from the fifth important inscription newly published²⁴ under the title of "The Mandasa Plates of Anantavarmadeva of Sāka 913," we get the following geneology of the Kadamba and the Gaṅga rulers:—

Bhāmakhēḍi

Dharmakhēḍi

Anantavarma

(Vajrahasta)

Dharmakhēḍi, the donor of this Grant has the same titles as those of the previous one and it is therefore clear that the G.K. year 520 which is the same as the Gaṅga year 520, corresponds to S'āka 913 or A.D. 991 approximately. In other words, the Gaṅga Era started about S' 393 or A. D. 471.

The following geneology and chronology, supplied by all the C. P. Grants of Anantavarma Vajrahasta III and several of Anantavarma Chōdagaṅga enable us in getting still nearer the starting point of the Gaṅga Era²⁵:—

1. Guṇamahārṇava Mahārājah S' 816

2. Vajrahasta I 44 years (S' 816—860)

3. Guṇḍama 3 years (S' 860-863)	4. Kāmārṇava 35 years (S' 863-898)	5. Vijayāditya 3 years (S' 898-901)
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--


6. Anantavarma Aniyankabhima Vajrahasta II 35 years (S' 901-936)

²⁴ J.B.O.R.S. Vol. XVII, Pp 175—188. It was long before noticed in Ep. Report for 1917—18 where the date *Sakabde navasataka sapatarasa* was interpreted as S 976. But Mr. G. Ramados who published the grant interprets it as S 913. Owing to the *Samasta* or *Anka* mode of reckoning adopted in a C. P. Grant for the first time here, I am inclined to accept this new interpretation of the date.

²⁵ In editing the Nadagam Plates of Vajrahasta III, the veteran Andhra Scholar, Rao Saheb Prof. G. V. Ramamurty Pantulu stated thus:—"There are several discrepancies in the grant of Chodaganga of S 1040 that make it suspicious. It does not mention Vajrahasta I. It makes Vajrahasta III, the son of Madhukamarnava while the present grant makes him the son of Kamarnava and grandson of Vajrahasta II." Evidently, the names of the 6 or 7 kings mentioned as having ruled previous to Gunamaharnava faintly represent those of the Early Ganga Line. The same scholar identified, with great reason, Kalinganagara (which is identified by several scholars with the modern Kalingapattanam) with Mukhaljngam—Nagarikatakam in Parla-Kimidi Zamindari. Vide E.I. vol. 4 p 187

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 7. Kāmārṇava $1\frac{1}{2}$ year
S' 936-937 | 8. Guṇḍama
3 yrs. (S' 938-941) | 9. Madhukāmārṇava
19 years (S' 941-960) |
| 10. Anantavarma Vajrahasta III 33 years (accession in S' 960) | | |
| 11. Devendravarma Rājarāja 8 years (accession in S' 992) | | |
| 12. Anantavarma Chōdagaṅga (accession in S' 999). | | |

Dharmakhēḍi, son of Bhāmakhēḍi of the Mandasa Plates of the time of Anantavarma of S'. 913 appears to be identical with Dharmakhēḍi, son of Bhāmakhēḍi and grandson of Niyārṇava of the Simhapura Plates of Devendravarma dated in the Gaṅga-Kādamba Era 520. Since Anantavarma of the Plates is said to have been crowned in S'. 901, he must be identified with Anantavarma Aniyankabhima Vajrahastadeva (S' 901—S' 936), the 6th king of the geneological tree and Devendravarma of the Simhapura Plates with Kāmārṇava, the 7th king who is the eldest son of the 6th king and who ruled in S' 936. The titles Anantavarma and Devendravarma were apparently used for all the kings from Vajrahasta I to Chōdagaṅga, alternately. The 9th king of the Line, Madhukāmārṇava made a grant in 526 G. E. as noted already. Hence, the following Gaṅga-Kādamba Geneology and Chronology can be arranged from which we get the initial year of the Era in 494 A. D.

*Simhapura Plates.**Later Ganga Plates.**Mandasa Plates.*

Thus, Dharmakhēḍi of S. 913 and G. K. year 520 lived in the reigns of 6. Anantavarma and 7. Devendravarma and so, this G. K. year 520 which is the same as the Gaṅga year 520 corresponds to S' 936. If so, the Gaṅga year 526 mentioned by 9. Madhukāmārṇava corresponds to S' 942 which exactly falls in his second regnal year. Hence, the initial year of the Gaṅga or Gaṅga-Kādamba Era falls in S' 416 or A. D. 494. ✓

Taking the year A. D. 494 as the first year of the Gaṅga Era and considering that all the Early and the Later Gaṅgas belonged to the same Line and used the same Era till they gave it up for the Śāka Era at the close of the 10th century A. D. and considering also that the

geneology and chronology as given in all the published Grants of Vajra-hasta III and several of Anantavarma Chōḍagaṅga are correct and acceptable, we get the following geneological and chronological table for the whole of the Gaṅga Line:—

- † 1. Donor of Tirlingi Plates of 28th year = A.D. 522 *a*.

↓
 Mitavarma *a-1*.
 ↓
2. *Trikalingādhīpati* Indravarma I of 39th year = A.D. 533 *b*.

↓
 3. Anantavarmadeva
 ↓
4. Devendravarmadeva of 51st Gaṅga year = A.D. 545 *c*.

↓
 5. Satyavarmadeva of 51st Gaṅga year = A.D. 545 *d*.

6. *Rajasimha* Hastivarma of 80th year = A.D. 574 *e*.

↓
 8. Dānārṇava
 ↓
7. *Rajasimha* Indravarma of 87th and 91st years = A.D. 581 and 585 *f*.

↓
 9. Indravarma II of 128, 137, 138, and 154 years = A.D. 622, 631, 632 and 648 *g*.

↓
 10. Guṇārṇava
 ↓
11. Devendravarma of 183, 184 and 195 years = A.D. 677, 678 and 689 *h*.

12. Jayavarma

↓
13. Anantavarma of 204th year = A.D. 698 *i*.

↓

† The serial numbers show the order of the rule of kings. The sign | is used where a son is known to have succeeded the father and the sign : is used where the relationship is not mentioned. The dates are given both in the Gaṅga and the Śaka years and the equivalent Christian years.

- a* J.A.H.R.S. vol. 3 pp. 51-57
a-1 J.Bo.Br.R.A.S. vol. 16 p. 116 f.
b J.A.H.R.S. vol. 3 pp. 49-53
c Ind. Ant. vols. 10 pp. 243-244 and 13 pp. 273-276
d Ind. Ant. vols. 10 pp. 243-244 and 14 pp. 10-14
e Andhra Patrika Samvatsaradisanchika for 1920 pp. 217-224 and Ep. Indica. vol. 17 pp. 330-334
f J.A.H.R.S. vol. 4 pp. 21-24, Ind. Ant. vol. 16 pp. 131-134, Ep. Ind. vol. 3 pp. 127-133
g Ind. Ant. vol. 10 pp. 243-244 and vol. 13 pp. 119-124. Also Ep. Ind. vol. 14 p. 862, vol. 18 pp. 307-318, Appendix to Kalingadesacharitra pp. 40-41.
h Ep. Ind. vol. 3 pp. 130-134 vol. 13 p. 212 J.A.H.R.S. vol. 2 pp. 275-276,
i J.A.H.R.S. vol. 2 pp. 271-274 S. I. Ep. Reports for 1918-19 and 1920-1921

14. Nandavarma of 221st year = A.D. 715 *j.* 15. Devendravarma of 254th year = A.D. 748 *k.*
16. Rajendravarma
17. Anantavarma of 284 and 304 years = A.D. 778 and 798 *l.* 18. Devendravarma of 310 yr. = A.D. 804 *m.*
19. Rajendravarma of 313 and 342 = A.D. 807 and 836 *n.*
20. Vajri or Vajrahasta
21. Mārasimha
22. Bhūpēndravarma
23. Devendravarma of 397th year = A.D. 891 *o.*
24. Guṇarṇava or Guṇamahārṇava *p.* A.D. 894
25. Vajrahasta I A.D. 894-938
26. Guṇḍama A.D. 938-941 27. Kāmārṇava A.D. 941-976 28. Vijayaditya. A.D. 976-979
29. Anantavarma Aniyankabhīma Vajrahasta II (accession in S' 901) *q.* A.D. 979-1014
30. Devendravarma Kāmārṇava 31. Guṇḍa 32. Madhukāmārṇava G.E. 526. | G.E. 520. = A.D. 1014 *r* A.D. 1015-1018 A.D. 1019-1037 *s.*
33. Anantavarma Vajrahastadeva III (accession in S 960) A.D. 1037-1070 *t.*
34. Devendravarma Rājārājadeva (accession in S 992) A.D. 1070-1077 *u.*
35. Anantavarma Chōdagaṅgadeva (accession in S 999) A.D. 1077 *v.*

j J.A.H.R.S. vol. 2 pp. 185-189

k Ind. Ant. vol. 18 pp. 143-146

l Ep. Ind. vol. 3 pp. 17-21 S.I. Ep. Reports for 1918 pp. 137-138 and 1924 pp. 97-98

m Ep. Ind. vol. 18 pp. 311-313. Ep. Carnataka, Bangalore vol. Insc No. 140,

n J.B.O.R.S. vol. 12 p. 101 S.I. Ep. Reports for 1917-18 pp. 137-139 and 1923-24 pp. 97-98. *o* J.A.H.R.S. vol. 2 pp. 146-164

p The Table from this 24th king to the 35th king is arranged with the help of all the C.P. Grants of Vajrahasta III and three of Anantavarma Chodaganga.

q Insc. No. 828 in S.I. Ep. Report for 1917, J.B.O.R.S. vol. 17 pp. 175-188 Ep Ind. vol. 3 p. 220 and J.A.H.R.S. vol. 3 pp. 171-180

r J.A.H.R.S. vol. 3 pp. 171-180 *s* C.P. No. 3 in S.I. Ep. Report for 1918-1919

t Ep. Ind. vols. III pp. 222 III p. 183 IX p. 94 and XI p. 147. Also Appendix to Kalingadesacharitra pp. 50-58

u C.P. No. 3 in S.I. Ep. Report for 1918-1919

v J.A.H.R.S. vol. 1 pp. 40-48 and 106-124, Ind. Ant. vol. 18 pp. 161-167

NOTES AND NEWS.

Mughal Bibliography.

Messrs. D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., are to publish very shortly an annotated bibliography of books and manuscripts relating to the Mughals in India on Art, Science, Biography, History, Geography, Travels, Literature, Philosophy, Religion, Economics, Sports, &c. It is now being prepared and will be published early next year. Every effort is being made to make the bibliography as complete as possible. Authors desirous of having their works included in the Bibliography are requested to send particulars of their books or magazine articles to the Editor of the "Indian Literary Review", 190, Hornby Road, Bombay, as early as possible. The full title, author's name, number of pages and illustrations, year and place of publication should be clearly mentioned. If possible, a very short summary of the contents also should be given. If any persons or institutions happen to have any unique manuscript, full particulars of the same should be given.

Indian Historical Records Commission 1931.

Owing to the prevailing financial stringency, the Government of India have decided to postpone the annual meeting of the Indian Historical Records Commission this year. The next meeting of the Commission will, therefore, take place in 1932. The exact dates and the place of the meeting will be announced in due time.

Historical Records in the Satara Museum.

The Secretary of the I. H. R. Commission informs that in the Historical Museum at Satara (Bombay Presidency), there are about four thousand English papers mostly of the time of Lord Macartney, who was Governor of Madras from the 22nd June 1781 to the 8th June 1785. These papers fall under three heads, viz., (i) letters written by Lord Macartney to his contemporaries, (ii) letters written to Lord Macartney and (iii) letters referring to Lord Macartney and his Government. Students of History interested in these documents should communicate direct with the Curator of the Museum, who is prepared to give them facilities for studying these records at Satara.

Journal of the Bombay Historical Society.

A REPLY BY THE EDITOR.

Our attention has been drawn to the 'kindly criticism', as it is called, of our Journal, which appeared in the Journal of the Bombay

Historical Society, in the "Notes and News", pp 322—33; and we are much obliged for the valuable suggestions which the learned Editor has been pleased to offer us. We feel unable to appreciate the spirit with which the criticism seems to have been offered. The learned Editor may do well to remember the old English saying that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others. Our Contemporary has found such grievous errors in the printing of our Journal that it hastened to preach at once that, "the historian must always be accurate; and if accuracy is not found in a Journal of a historical research society, such society will not be counted for long among the learned societies of the scholarly world." We sincerely regret for the creeping of the several mistakes and feel obliged for the superciliousness with which the Editor of our contemporary has scanned them for our benefit. But, unfortunately, the same Journal of the Bombay Historical Society is not free from such errors as we have been accused of, and what is worse, it has been guilty of more grievous errors than those of ours. We shall take only a few random instances from the same number, which contains the criticism, to illustrate our point.

- | | | | |
|----|--------|--------------------|---|
| 1. | p. 300 | last line | 'collectin the valuable historical records' <i>for</i> 'collection of valuable historical records.' |
| 2. | p. 304 | line 10 | 'Hislory of Orissa' <i>for</i> 'History of Orissa.' |
| 3. | p. 304 | line 20 | sarighārāma <i>for</i> Saṁghārāma. |
| 4. | p. 309 | line 14 | The official head-quarrers <i>for</i> The official head-quarters. |
| 5. | p. 309 | line 17 | Secretary general <i>for</i> Secretary-General. |
| 6. | p. 309 | line 18 | Intellectual co-operation <i>for</i> Intellectual Co-operation. |
| 7. | p. 310 | last but one line. | The main source... are <i>for</i> The main sources....are |

We do not offer these instances in any spirit of retaliation. Yet we wish to remind the learned Editor how mistaken and inaccurate he was on another occasion. A colossal blunder was committed in the article, "Three Madras Museum Copper-plate Grants of Śaka 1544, 1565, and 1556." by B. A. Saletore, M. A., printed in pages 75 to 82 in volume II, No. 1., in the matter of printing the blocks of inscriptions, which doubtless might cause a painful surprise to the Editor of our contemporary. We noticed this long ago, but we refrained to comment because we knew that the Bombay Historical Society, though younger than ours, has been working with enthusiasm like ours and that such errors, however gross they might be, were pardonable. The photo-prints of the copper-plates given in that article do not represent the correct face of the writing on the plates, but the wrong side of it and therefore are quite useless to the epigraphist and the historian. Good money was wasted in making those photo-blocks and we offer our sympathy to the maker of the mistake. The Editor of our contemporary will kindly remember that it is bad policy to pick holes in another's coat, and permit us to remind him of the saying of the Lord Jesus (Vide Mathew: vii: 3—5). It would be proper for the learned Editor to take the beam out of his own eyes in the matter of editing and printing his Journal before endeavouring to remove the mote from his neighbour's eye.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL BODY MEETING HELD ON 4-4-31

The Tenth Annual Report For 1930-31.

The Secretary, Mr. R. Subba Rao, M.A., L.T. read the following report:—

The Managing Committee have great pleasure in presenting the following report of the Society's work done during the year 1930-31.

At the last Annual meeting of the Society held on 19-4-1930 under the Presidentship of M.R.Ry. J. Ramayya Pantulu Garu, B.A., B.L., the Secretary's report and the Treasurer's accounts were presented and passed and then the following Office-Bearers were elected for the year.

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | M.R.Ry. J. Ramayya Pantulu garu, B.A., B.L., President. | |
| 2 | „ G. Gangadhara Somayajulu garu, M.A., B.L. Vice-President. | |
| 3 | „ R. Subba Rao garu, M.A., L.T., Secretary. | |
| 4 | „ N. Kameswararao garu, B.A., B.L., Treasurer. | |
| 5 | „ D. Venkatarao garu, M.A., L.T., Librarian. | |
| 6 | „ A. Sankararao garu, B.A., L.T., | } Members of the
Managing Council. |
| 7 | „ V. Jagannadharao garu, M.A., L.T., | |
| 8 | „ D. Sreeramamurty garu, B.A., | |
| 9 | „ B. V. Kristna Rao garu, B.A., B.L., | |

In the evening. a Public meeting wae held in the Hindu Samaj Hall under the Chairmanship of Rao Sahib C. V. Kristnasami Iyer Avl., B.A., B.L., Dt. Judge, when Messrs J. Ramayya Pantulu and R. Subbarao read papers on '*the Mulkāpāram stone Inscription*' and '*Two New Copper-Plate Inscriptions of Vijayāditya Maharaja, of the Eastern Chālukya Dynasty*'.

Members.

The number of ordinary members on 1...4...1931 stands at 242 as compared with 226 on 1...4...1930. There is an increase in the number of mofussil members. The Society lost in late Mr. G. G. Somayajulu, the Vice-President of the Society, a very valuable member and research scholar.

Subscriptions.

As compared with the number of 29 Indian and Foreign subscribers on rolls on 1...4...30, there is at present the number of 40 which is distinctly encouraging and which shows the increasing popularity and usefulness of the Society.

Patrons.

The Society lost, most unfortunately, in the deaths of Rao Bahadur D. Lakshminarayana of Kampte, and Sri Raja Ramachendradeb, Maharaja of Jeypore, two eminent and generous-minded Patrons of the Society. The Maharaja of Pithapur expressed his inability to continue as a Patron. The Society however, gained a new Patron in Sri Raja Gajapathi Ramachendra Deb. the Maharaja of Puri.

Exchanges.

The list of exchanges has also increased from 72 to 80 showing that the work of the Society is widely appreciated.

Journal.

During the year, Mr. B. V. Kristna Rao continued to edit the Journal which has improved in get up and quality and foreign and Indian contributors have come forward to use its space. During the year, parts 3 & 4 of Vol. 4 and parts 1 & 2 of vol. 5 have been printed. Part 3 of Vol. 5 is under print and will issue soon. Several new C. P. Inscriptions of the Gaṅga, Chalukya and Vijayanagara Kings have been published. The Society's best thanks are due to the Editor and the Editorial Board as well as to the Contributors for improving the quality of the Journal.

Kalingadesa Charitra.

At the time of the last annual meeting, 86 forms of the work (688 pages) were printed. But now the book is complete, the index being printed in this week. It numbers in all 830 pages (576 pages of book proper, 104 pages of supplement of inscriptions, 30 pages of contents and introduction and the rest index). The council takes this opportunity to place on record its heartiest thanks to all the Donors, and in particular to the Rajah of Parlakimidi and to Sir A. P. Patro, Kt., B.A., B.L., M.L.C., to the Contributors who have rendered valuable help to produce such a standard work and last but not least, to the Editor Mr. R. Subba Rao, M.A., L.T. and the Editorial Board for sparing no pains to bring out the work.

Meetings and other Activities.

During the year, the Society held 9 Managing Council Meetings to transact the usual business of the Society such as passing of accounts and admitting new members and exchanges. The Society also arranged under its auspices a Public meeting on 19-1-1931, when Mr. C. S. Sreenivasachari M.A. Professor, Pachiappa's College, Madras delivered an interesting lecture on '*British Beginnings in Andhra Desa*' in the local Govt. Arts College Hall.

During the year, the Society deputed the Hon. Secretary, Mr. R. Subbarao, M.A., L.T., and Mr. M. Ramarao, B.A., (Hons.) a member

to attend the XIII Session of the I.H.R. Commission and the VI Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, held at Patna in December 1930. The Government of India in addition to re-nominating Mr. R. Subbarao as a Corresponding Member of the I.H.R.C. for another period of 3 years, co-opted him as a Member of the Patna Commission. The Secretary exhibited several Copper-plates, Coins, Photos of temples and stupas, and Original letters relating to the Correspondence between the Kandregula family and the Hon'ble East India Company, both at the Historical Records Exhibition held at Patna and the All-Asia Educational Exhibition held at Benares.

As a result of the Secretary's interview with Sir Frank Noyce at Gwalior last year, the Government of India have been pleased during the year to sanction the supply of 1. Archaeological Survey Reports 2. Memoirs 3. Epigraphical Reports of S. circle 4. S. I. Inscriptions and 5. other Government publications, *free of cost* to the Society. The local Municipal Council sanctioned Rs 100 for the Society's up-keep and the Local Government gave Rs. 400 towards library improvement. The Society's best thanks are, therefore, due to all of them.

Library and Museum,

The details of progress are given in the Librarian's report. The library contains now 591 Volumes, out of which number, books received this year amount to 192 including the 25 books purchased out of Govt. grant for 1929-1930. This year, the Government have again made a library grant of Rs. 400. in addition to the Municipal grant of Rs 100 and the whole amount will be spent in purchasing Indian Antiquary Journals.

The Museum has also received certain additions. The impressions of 2 more new C. P. Grants published in the Journal Vol. V, part 1, a piece of ancient sculpture depicting the hand of Siva, obtained from Dendalur, and some old copper coins of Kushan Kings, received in exchange of some Andhra Lead Coins have really enriched the Museum. All these were collected and presented to the Museum by the Secretary. The several photographs, taken in connection with the Kalinga Day Celebrations, have been framed and placed in the Society's Rooms. The photos of the Patrons and Donors are also placed in the Reading Room.

Finance.

The details are given in the Treasurer's Report. While the amount of subscriptions from Members has increased by a thousand rupees, that from the Patrons and Donors has decreased. The Society has still to pay the Treasurer Rs 200 while the Members are in arrears to the same extent. Unless the Government and the Public Bodies come to the rescue, the Society will have very bad times in future.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, the Council place on record their cordial thanks to all those Scholars who helped with contributions and requests them to bring more of their friends into the Society. It also offers its grateful thanks to all the Patrons and Donors who have helped it with liberal donations and requests them to continue the help, so that the Society may be able to do still more useful work in future.

Treasurer's Statement of Receipts & Expenditure (from 1-4-30 to 31-3-31).

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE	
Last year's Balance	380 13 10	Postage	225 14 9
Subscriptions from		Travelling Expenses	93 0 0
Members	... 1143 5 0	Printing	... 1073 10 0
Subscriptions from		Blocks & Photos	115 5 0
Subscribers	... 304 2 0	Furniture	... 70 0 0
Municipal grant	100 0 0	Purchase of books	26 5 0
Govt. Library grant	400 0 0	Binding books	30 0 0
Miscellaneous	7 0 0	Peon's pay	112 15 11
Sale of Journals	37 7 0	Stationary	4 7 0
Sale of Santhikas	21 0 0	Room rent	200 0 0
Mis. Receipts	5 14 6	Typing charges	9 0 0
Advance by Treasurer	60 0 0	Permanent advance to	
		Secretary and Editor	
		for postage.	18 13 0
		Returned to Treasurer	60 0 0
		Mis. charges.	8 11 6
		Balance in S. B. A.	10 7 1
		Balance on hand.	401 0 7
	Rs. 2459 10 4		2459 10 4

N. B:—5 copies of Rajaraja Pattabhisheka Sanchika have been sold during the year and 1 copy was given as a complimentary copy. The price of 1 copy sold has yet to be realised. The number of copies on hand on 31—3—31 is 118.

The Stock of Journals is as follows:

Vol V Pt 1; 184. Pt 2; 216. Vol IV Pts. 1 & 2; 180. Pts 3 & 4 195.
Vol III Pt 1, 96. Pts 2, 3, 4; 115. Vol II Pt 1; 81. Pt 2; 125.
Pts 3&4; 114. Vol I Pt 2; 32. Pt III 97. Pt IV 170.

This Statement represents the correct state of the accounts maintained by the Treasurer. Each item of expenditure is supported by a voucher.

(Sd.) M. SIVARAMA KRISHNAYYA B.A.
Auditor.

Librarian's Report.

1930-31.

The number of books the Library contains today, including the bound volumes of journals, is 591.

Out of this number, books received and volumes registered in the year 1930-31, the year under review, number 192, including the 25 books purchased out of the Government Grant for the year 1929-30.

An analysis of the additions in the year under review is as follows:—

Books purchased out of Govt. grant	...	25
Books purchased out of the Society's funds	...	3
Exchanges received during the year	...	105
Books received and review	...	15
Books presented	...	13
Bound volumes & Society's publications added.	...	31
	Total	192

The Municipal Council have granted Rs. 100 and the Government have granted Rs. 400 for the year 1930-31; and this amount will be available for books for the coming year.

The number of visitors that availed themselves of the Reading Room was 330 as per the Visitor's Book.

Number of books taken home and used by members of the Society was 127.

Sufficiently extensive use of the library is not being made by the Public yet; and the location of the library in the present congested room which is not convenient for easy-reading in the evening time is perhaps a handicap

The work of sorting and cataloguing the books of the library still remains to be done; and the librarian regrets that he could not devote himself to this task.

Lists of books and journals exchanged, presented, and received for review are appended to this report.

RECEIPTS FOR THE QUARTER.

Members who paid their Subscriptions during the quarter ending
with 31-3-31.

Purushottam Sonti	3	8	0	Paramanandacharya	3	8	0
Mitter Kalepada	3	8	0	Rangaswami Saraswati A.	3	8	0
Suryaprakasa Rao Ch.	3	8	0	Ramakrishna Rao D.	4	0	0
Narayana Sastri C. L.	7	0	0	Venkata Rao Ch.	3	0	0
Satyanarayana B. T. N.	3	8	0	Jaidat pant	3	8	0
Kibe M. V.	3	8	0	Srinivasaraghavachari M.K.	2	0	0
Raja of Puri (1926 to 31)	17	0	0	Thompson M. S. H.	3	12	0
Jaganatha Rao V.	2	0	0	Raghavachary N.	3	8	0
Krishnaswamy Iyer S.	4	0	0	Atmaram C.	3	0	0
Satyanarayana V.	2	0	0	Krishnamurti M.	2	0	0
Aichuta Rao T.	2	0	0	Bhadrappa P.	2	0	0
Sarma Sic B. N.	3	8	0	Brahmaje Rao K.	2	0	0
Ganganna Jayanti	4	0	0	Narayana D. L.	3	8	0
Hanumantha Rao C. V.	3	0	0				

101 4 0

Subscriptions received from Subscribers during the Quarter.

Iswara Library, Coconada.	6	8	0
Anuamalai University for 5 Vols	32	8	0
Andhra University for 5 Vols	32	8	0
	Rs	71	0 0

Donations received during the Quarter.

The Rajahmundry Municipal council	100	0	0
Library Grant by Government	400	0	0
	Rs	500	0 0

